

Ad 9335. 1^a 203

IPS 1-8



GIVEN BY

Atal
INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE
NEW YORK CITY AREA—Part 5

HEARING
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES
Copy HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

JULY 6, 1953

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities



COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois, *Chairman*

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

KIT CLARDY, Michigan

GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

CLYDE DOYLE, California

JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR., Tennessee

ROBERT L. KUNZIG, *Counsel*

FRANK S. TAVENNER, JR., *Counsel*

LOUIS J. RUSSELL, *Chief Investigator*

THOMAS W. BEALE, SR., *Chief Clerk*

RAPHAEL I. NIXON, *Director of Research*

CONTENTS

Testimony of—	Page
William Michelson.....	1971
Carl Andren.....	1981
David Livingston.....	1990
Arthur Osman.....	2005
Jack Paley.....	2005
Peter Stein.....	2005
Herbert A. Philbrick.....	2007
Archibald Roosevelt.....	2031

(NOTE.—Index to this volume will be printed at end of "Investigation of Communist Activities in the New York City Area—Part 8.")

PUBLIC LAW 601, 79TH CONGRESS

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress [1946], chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, * * **

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RULE X

SEC. 121. STANDING COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

(A) Un-American activities.

(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

RULES ADOPTED BY THE 83^d CONGRESS

House Resolution 5, January 3, 1953

* * * * *

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress, the following standing committees:

* * * * *

(g) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

* * * * *

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American Activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time, investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by an person designated by any such chairman or member.

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE NEW YORK CITY AREA—PART 5

MONDAY, JULY 6, 1953

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON
UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
New York, N. Y.

PUBLIC HEARING

The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to call, at 10:45 a. m., in room 1305 of the United States Courthouse, Foley Square, New York, N. Y., Hon. Kit Clardy (acting chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer, and Francis E. Walter.

Staff members present: Robert L. Kunzig, counsel; Louis J. Russell, chief investigator; W. Jackson Jones, investigator; and Mrs. Juliette Joray, acting clerk.

Mr. CLARDY. The committee will be in order.

Last night our chairman, the Honorable Harold H. Velde of Illinois, was taken ill, which accounts for the fact that I am presiding today.

The first witness will be heard in executive session this morning. Later other witnesses possibly may, before the day is over, be heard in open session, am I not correct, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. KUNZIG. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. The hearing room will, therefore, necessarily have to be cleared at this time, but the press and others who are interested in this proceeding will be advised when we open the doors at the proper time.

Mr. Counsel, will you take care of the necessary arrangements?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, sir. May I state for the record, sir, that upon the request of other departments of Government the first hearing will be, as you said, in executive session in the interests of national security.

Mr. CLARDY. That is my understanding.

Mr. KUNZIG. Then we are ready to proceed if the room will be cleared, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. All right; you may call your first witness as soon as the hearing room is cleared.

(Thereupon the subcommittee went into executive session. After the executive session, the subcommittee again went into public session, the proceedings of which follow.)

PUBLIC HEARING

AFTERNOON SESSION

(At the hour of 2:15 p. m., of the same day, the proceedings were resumed, Representatives Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer, Francis E. Walter, and Morgan M. Moulder being present.)

Mr. CLARDY. For the purpose of the record, let it be shown that the chairman has appointed a subcommittee consisting of Mr. Clardy, Mr. Scherer, Mr. Walter, and Mr. Moulder, for the purpose of this hearing.

Will you call your witness, counsel?

Mr. KUNZIG. Call in Mr. William Michelson and his lawyer.

Mr. SHEINBERG. In behalf of my client, he objects to any photograph, and he also objects to giving his testimony before this battery of cameras and these lights.

Mr. CLARDY. Be seated, counsel.

Mr. SHEINBERG. May I make that as a formal request?

Mr. CLARDY. The witness has been sworn.¹

All right, are you ready, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, sir?

Mr. CLARDY. All right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Michelson, would you please—

Mr. CLARDY. Pardon me, counsel. I think the members of the press have been given the statement that the chairman intended to present at the opening of this hearing this afternoon, but which his illness has prevented, and at this point I shall ask that it be placed in the record. I shall refrain from reading it, because I think it is unnecessary.

(The statement by Harold H. Velde, chairman, House Committee on Un-American Activities, is as follows:)

At this point this afternoon in the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, we turn our attention to subversion in the field of labor.

The many distinguished labor leaders in this country have spoken as with one voice in damning communism in union activities. This committee, acting under Public Law 601 of the 79th Congress, joins with these leaders in denouncing subversive actions wherever such may exist in the American unions.

I wish again to emphasize, as I have so often in the past, that this committee will investigate communism wherever it may be found, whether among individuals in Government, in the schools, business, clergy, or labor. No one shall be immune, that he may carry on Communist or subversive activities against the American people.

I promise that we shall use every legal weapon at our command to expose such un-American activities wherever they may exist. The House of Representatives has imposed a serious and vital duty upon this committee. We shall earnestly attempt to fulfill this duty, so that we may obtain facts upon which to base recommendations for appropriate legislation.

A number of witnesses in various phases of our investigations who live in this city asked to testify in New York at this time to aid the committee in its work. It was therefore found more convenient and far more economical to hold our current hearings here, rather than require witnesses and their attorneys to travel to Washington.

Mr. CLARDY. Will you proceed.

¹ The witness, William Michelson, was sworn in executive session, preceding his public appearance, on the same day.

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM MICHELSON, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, ARTHUR SHEINBERG

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Michelson, I noted you are accompanied by counsel. Would counsel please state his name and office address for the record?

Mr. SHEINBERG. Arthur Sheinberg, 1501 Broadway.

Mr. CLARDY. Let the record show at this time the witness was previously sworn in executive session a few moments ago.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Michelson, would you state your name and address, please?

Mr. MICHELSON. William Michelson, 110-56 Sixty-third Drive, Forest Hills.

Mr. KUNZIG. When and where were you born, Mr. Michelson?

Mr. MICHELSON. March 9, 1914, in Chelsea, Mass.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you give the committee a résumé of your educational background?

Mr. MICHELSON. I completed high school and attended City College at night for a few sessions.

Mr. KUNZIG. What year did you finish high school?

Mr. MICHELSON. 1931.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, would you give the committee a résumé of your occupational backgrounds, sir?

(At this point Mr. Michelson conferred with Mr. Sheinberg.)

Mr. MICHELSON. I began working in 1932 and 1933 at various jobs. I was employed by a department store in New York in 1934, and from then until 1937 continued to be employed in a department store, and in 1937 I went to work for the union.

Mr. KUNZIG. What union was that?

Mr. MICHELSON. That was Local 2 of the Retail and Wholesale Department Store Workers Union.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you worked for the union ever since?

Mr. MICHELSON. That union, yes, or its successors.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you now employed by the union?

Mr. MICHELSON. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is your present position in the union?

Mr. MICHELSON. I am organizational director of District 65, CIO.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is that here in New York?

Mr. MICHELSON. That is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Michelson, have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MICHELSON. I decline to answer under the privilege granted me by the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MICHELSON. The same answer, sir.

Mr. WALTER. What comprises district 65, Mr. Michelson?

Mr. MICHELSON. District 65, sir, consists of approximately 30,000 workers in New York City.

Mr. WALTER. All in New York City?

Mr. MICHELSON. All in New York City.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have here a copy of the Daily Worker of Monday, October 28, 1940, headlined "Labor, Civic Leaders Demand Commu-

nists Get Rightful Place on Ballot in New York State," and one of those people listed in the newspaper here as demanding it, that the Communists get a rightful place on the ballot in this State, is William Michelson of Local 3 of United Retail and Wholesale Workers Union.

(At this point Mr. Michelson conferred with Mr. Sheinberg.)

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you that Michelson? The question is, are you that William Michelson?

Mr. MICHELSON. I decline to answer on the grounds that the answer might incriminate me. I am invoking the privilege under the fifth amendment, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. If you wish, we can just say "same grounds," and we will understand what you mean.

Mr. MICHELSON. That will facilitate it.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you demand that the Communists get a rightful place on the ballot in New York?

Mr. MICHELSON. Same answer.

Mr. WALTER. What is that date of that paper?

Mr. KUNZIG. That was in 1940, sir; October 28, 1940.

Did you appear before Congressman Kersten and a Labor Committee of the House of Representatives investigating communism in unions?

Mr. MICHELSON. Same answer, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. You are not going to answer the question even as to whether you appeared there?

Mr. MICHELSON. Same answer.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, I think that is a matter of public record, so the Chair directs that you answer that question.

(At this point Mr. Michelson conferred with Mr. Sheinberg.)

Mr. MICHELSON. Sir, in view of the nature of that investigation and the report issued by that committee, I must respectfully decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you not appear before the committee, and did you not refuse to answer at that time in 1948 questions as to any possible Communist activity on your behalf?

(At this point Mr. Michelson conferred with Mr. Sheinberg.)

Mr. KUNZIG. On your part?

Mr. MICHELSON. Sir, the record would speak for itself.

Mr. CLARDY. I direct the witness to answer that question.

Mr. MICHELSON. Sir, I must decline to answer then on the same grounds in view of the scope of that investigation, some of its findings, and the record of that investigation.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have here in front of me—

Mr. CLARDY. Let me interrupt. All you are asking him in those questions is as to whether or not as a matter of fact he did appear at those hearings and testify.

Mr. KUNZIG. That was my first question, sir, and then the next question was whether he appeared and took the fifth amendment and refused to testify.

Mr. CLARDY. I wanted to be sure the record discloses that. Proceed.

Mr. KUNZIG. In other words, he has taken the fifth amendment on the fifth amendment, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. That is right. I have instructed him to answer, and he has refused.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have in my hands a photostatic copy of the Daily Worker of Monday, June 6, 1949, in which there is headlined a story in which there are rallies and so forth involving the jailing of the three Communist leaders in the Medina trial. Among those protesting, it lists a William Michelson, president of local 2, New York Stores Employees Union (Gimbel's), in parentheses. Are you that William Michelson?

Mr. MICHELSON. I must decline to answer on the same ground.

Mr. KUNZIG. You do not have to decline. There is no requirement that you decline. Do you decline?

Mr. MICHELSON. I decline to answer on the same grounds, sir.

Pardon me a moment.

(At this point Mr. Michaelson conferred with Mr. Sheinberg.)

Mr. MICHELSON. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the previous question——

Mr. CLARDY. Which question was that?

Mr. MICHELSON. The question in regard to my appearance before the Kersten committee——

Mr. CLARDY. Yes.

Mr. MICHELSON. I would like to indicate to you, sir, that the fact that I invoke the privilege in connection with that—I did not mean to be noncooperative with this committee. I did appear before that committee. My invoking of the fifth amendment related to the substance of some of the questions and the scope of that examination and the findings.

Mr. CLARDY. That may have been your intention, but actually the answer and the reason I directed you to answer the question was that the answer did actually not say just what you think you are now saying, and I am glad you have chosen to correct it. Your attorney has apparently given you some very good advice on that.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have in front of me a photostatic copy of a clipping from the Daily Worker of July 28, 1949, page 2, headlined, "Notables Wire Clark."

In a telegram to Attorney General Clark nine prominent Americans termed the treatment of noncitizens by the Justice Department as "reminiscent of Nazi methods of treatment of minorities," it was announced yesterday by the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.

Signers of the telegrams were——

and among others it lists William Michelson, president, local 2, department store workers.

Did you sign such a telegram under the auspices of the American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born?

Mr. MICHELSON. Same answer, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. May I state for the record that the American Committee——

Mr. CLARDY. Wait, did I understand your question was merely as to whether or not he signed the telegram, which is a matter of record now?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, sir; that was my question.

Mr. CLARDY. Then I direct the witness to answer the question.

(At this point Mr. Michelson conferred with Mr. Sheinberg.)

Mr. MICHELSON. Sir, I must respectfully decline.

Mr. KUNZIG. May I state for the record that the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born was cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark in June 1948, and September 1948. It was listed as, "One of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States," by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in 1944 and in 1942; also by the California Committee on Un-American Activities in 1947 and in 1948.

Mr. WALTER. May I see that telegram, please?

Mr. CLARDY. Counsel, I do not think there is any doubt about the fact that that has been subversive.

Mr. MOULDER. Rarely do people sign a telegram. I want to ask the question, did you authorize the sending of such a telegram?

(At this point Mr. Michelson conferred with Mr. Sheinberg.)

Mr. MICHELSON. Sir, I must also respectfully invoke the privilege, the same answer.

Mr. MOULDER. I am sure that is what counsel intended to ask in the first place, whether or not you authorized the telegram or authority that your name be used on the telegram.

Mr. CLARDY. Are you aware of the fact that such a telegram was sent, irrespective of whether you signed it?

Mr. MICHELSON. Sir, the same answer.

Mr. CLARDY. The Chair must—

Mr. MICHELSON. Pardon me a moment.

(At this point Mr. Michelson conferred with Mr. Sheinberg.)

Mr. MICHELSON. Sir, I must stand on my answer.

Mr. CLARDY. I must direct you to answer it for reasons that I think should be obvious to you now.

Mr. MICHELSON. Sir, I must respectfully decline to answer.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have a copy of the Daily Worker of New York, February 18, 1942, which headlines a story, "Browder Meetings Begin With Rally Today." This discusses meetings, a series of "Free Browder" meetings, throughout the city with the sponsorship of the New York City division of the Committee to Free Earl Browder. The list of citywide rallies follows, and it lists Manhattan, and on Wednesday, February 18, it lists William Michelson.

Did you participate in a rally, Mr. Michelson, to free Earl Browder at that time in the State as listed in the Daily Worker?

Mr. MICHELSON. The same answer.

Mr. CLARDY. Again what was that date, counsel?

Mr. KUNZIG. Wednesday, February 18, 1942.

Did you work on any Committee to Free Earl Browder?

Mr. MICHELSON. The same answer, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. The New York Trade Union Committee to Free Earl Browder, may I state for the record, was cited by this committee as among the projects and campaigns of the Communist Party. Browder was general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States of America.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, you knew there was such a movement, did you not?

Mr. MICHELSON. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. There are other records here, Mr. Chairman, which with your permission I will pass over, all involving various meetings to free Earl Browder, and all and each and every one listing the name

of William Michelson as a speaker or panel participant in one form or another.

Did you participate in the Schappes Defense Committee?

Mr. CLARDY. Say that again, counsel?

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you participate in the Schappes Defense Committee?

Mr. MICHELSON. Same answer, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have here in front of me a folder called "In the case of Morris U. Schappes, anti-Fascist trade union leader, college teacher, sentenced to State prison 1½ to 2 years for his political opinions."

"Free Morris Schappes—fighter against fascism."

Sponsors of the committee—among them are names including Michelson, William Michelson, manager, local 2, United Retail and Wholesale Employees Union, CIO.

Are you the William Michelson listed in this pamphlet?

Mr. MICHELSON. The same answer, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. The Schappes Defense Committee is cited as Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark in a letter to Loyalty Review Board, April 27, 1949. It was listed by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in 1944 as—

A front organization with a strictly Communist objective, namely, the defense of a self-admitted Communist who was convicted of perjury in the courts of New York.

Morris U. Schappes was on the teaching staff of the College of the City of New York for a period of 13 years. In 1936 his superior on the college faculty refused to recommend him for reappointment. This action led to prolonged agitation by the Communist Party.

It was also cited by the California Committee on Un-American Activities.

I also have another document from the Daily Worker of February 4, 1942, as to the same point, but I will not belabor and waste the time of the committee.

Mr. CLARDY. Those citations, counsel, by the way, are taken from an official publication of this committee?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes; the citations are taken from the Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications, revised as of May 14, 1951, prepared and released by this committee in Washington, D. C.

Mr. WALTER. When those revisions are made, do you make a further inquiry into the present objectives?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, sir. As a matter of fact, there is a very exhaustive inquiry going on into all this at the present time with the thought in mind of a new edition of this publication.

Mr. WALTER. I notice that most of that is ancient history, and I am just wondering whether you made it current.

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, sir; there is a lot of material in that publication which is very current. It just happens at the moment we are dealing with past history involving this witness.

Mr. CLARDY. As I understand it, our staff is engaged in the work of revision at the moment.

Mr. KUNZIG. That is correct, sir.

I have in front of me a copy of the Worker, Sunday, June 6, 1948, "Vets to Set Up Permanent Lobby Against Mundt Bill." William Michelson is listed as one of those involved in the permanent veterans'

lobby in Washington to halt the passage of the Mundt bill. Are you the William Michelson listed in this article?

Mr. MICHELSON. Same answer, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. May I say, this saying "same answer" I disagree with. I disagree with the procedure of the witness as to the same answer. Of course, it is never responsive to the question. He refuses to answer, and I think he should state his grounds.

Mr. WALTER. That is right.

Mr. MICHELSON. Sir, the counsel told me, instructed me to answer in that fashion.

Mr. KUNZIG. I thought it might save time.

Mr. MOULDER. I know he did. I said I disagree.

Mr. KUNZIG. I thought we understood when he says "same answer" he means to say, "I am declining to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment because I feel"—et cetera.

Mr. MOULDER. Are you a veteran?

Mr. MICHELSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Did you serve in the Armed Forces?

Mr. MICHELSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. How long?

Mr. MICHELSON. About four and a half years.

Mr. MOULDER. What branch of the service?

Mr. MICHELSON. Infantry.

Mr. MOULDER. In the Army?

Mr. MICHELSON. Right, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Overseas?

Mr. MICHELSON. No, sir; in the States.

Mr. MOULDER. Where were you stationed?

Mr. MICHELSON. I was stationed in various parts, mostly in the Southwest. I was somewhere halfway through my Army career when I was injured and placed on limited service and as a result was not eligible to go overseas for the last 2 or 3 years of service.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have here a document on which is printed, "1,000 Trade Union Officials Urge You To Protest the 12 Smith Act Indictments." Then there is a letter to President Truman, and one of those signatures at the end, printed, of course, but listed here among other names, is William Michelson, secretary, Joint Board of the Retail & Wholesale Department Store Clerks. Are you the William Michelson that is listed there in this letter to President Truman protesting the 12 Smith Act indictments?

Mr. MICHELSON. I decline to answer, sir, on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. CLARDY. Will you date that, counsel, or can you? It mentioned 12. That is the——

Mr. KUNZIG. There were 12 at first before one was dropped.

Mr. CLARDY. And then 11?

Mr. KUNZIG. There is no date on this, sir, but it was obviously at the time that the action was started, 1948 and 1949, probably 1949, against the leaders of the Communist Party and what became known as the Medina trial.

Mr. CLARDY. Which has also been popularly labeled as the trial of the 11 Communists.

Mr. KUNZIG. That is right; one was dropped because of ill health, and it became 11. It originally was 12.

Mr. CLARDY. I just wanted it identified.

Mr. KUNZIG. This petition was put out by the Civil Rights Congress. Have you at any time been identified with the Civil Rights Congress?

Mr. MICHELSON. I must decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. The Civil Rights Congress, as I guess we all know, has been cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark in 1947 and 1948 and is cited—

As an organization formed in April 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties); "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it."

It was also cited by the congressional Committee on Un-American Activities, 1947 report.

Mr. CLARDY. How many more of those do you have?

Mr. KUNZIG. Just a few, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. All right.

Mr. KUNZIG. "Unionists Start Nationwide Drive Against the North Atlantic War Pact," is the headline in the New York Daily Worker, April 14, 1949. It lists a group of so-called, alleged prominent union leaders opposing the Atlantic Pact and urging negotiations for an American-Soviet pact of peace and friendship, and listed among the signers typed here in this article in the Daily Worker is William Michelson.

Are you the William Michelson listed there?

Mr. MICHELSON. I must decline to answer on the same grounds, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you authorize your name to be used to such a petition for the American-Soviet pact of peace and friendship?

Mr. MICHELSON. I must decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Under the auspices of the Civil Rights Congress, which I have just mentioned a few minutes ago and for which I listed the citations, I have here under the date of October 11, 1947, a call to a conference for the abolition of the Un-American Activities Committee, at Manhattan Center, Saturday, October 11, 1947, and there, under a panel and program conference, under labor, a panel participant is listed as William Michelson, along with Russell A. Nixon and several others. Are you the William Michelson who appeared in this panel conference seeking the abolition of the Un-American Activities Committee?

Mr. MICHELSON. I must decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you favor the elimination of the Un-American Activities Committee as of this moment?

(At this point Mr. Michelson conferred with Mr. Sheinberg.)

Mr. MICHELSON. I would decline to answer, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. CLARDY. You can't possibly incriminate yourself, witness, and I am deadly serious about this, in telling us your viewpoint on that.

Mr. MICHELSON. Excuse me.

(At this point Mr. Michelson conferred with Mr. Sheinberg.)

Mr. MICHELSON. Sir, I must maintain the same answer that I gave previously.

Mr. KUNZIG. I wish at this point to read into the record here 2 or 3 sentences from an investigation of communism in New York City

Distributive Trades hearings before the Special Committee of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 80th Congress, 2d session.

During the time of the hearings, which were held on June 30, July 1 and 2, and so on, there was the testimony by one Mr. Kirkpatrick who testified:

Local 2 is at Gimbel's and Saks 34th Street department stores. The president of the local is William Michelson. The other person who has been the second in command for a good many years of the local is Anna Blank. William Michelson, I have previously testified, is a member of the Communist Party and has met in secret conferences and caucuses of the various officers of the Communist Party, various officers of these locals in the distributive trades field who are also members of the Communist Party. At times they have sat in within these meetings with top officials of the Communist Party, such as William Z. Foster, Earl Browder, Jack Stachel, and others.

Mr. WALTER. Whose testimony?

Mr. KUNZIG. This is testimony of a Mr. Kirkpatrick, and I have that.

Mr. SCHERER. You were going to ask him whether that testimony is true or not; is that right?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes.

Is that testimony correct, and were you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MICHELSON. I must decline to answer on the same ground, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have, Mr. Chairman, no further questions to ask of this witness.

I want to make sure that I have asked one question, and that is: Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MICHELSON. I must decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. CLARDY. You mean you do decline?

Mr. MICHELSON. I do decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Scherer, do you have any questions?

Mr. SCHERER. Have you ever contributed any funds to the Communist Party?

Mr. MICHELSON. I must also decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have one more question, sir. There has been discussion at various times—and I don't have the exact citation here—even in the Daily Worker, Mr. Michelson, to the effect that whatever may have been, if any, of the leftist or Communist background of you and various others, that you now were turning away from that, and that you were leading the union away from any such activities, and it has been said to me very recently by people here in New York that you profess to be leading the union away from such activities, and that you are no longer in any way connected with that, and, therefore, I ask you the question again I just asked: Are you now a member of the Communist Party, and here is a chance to show where you are leading the union, whether it is away from such activities?

Mr. MICHELSON. I must decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. I think that is perfectly clear, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. Indeed it is.

Mr. SCHERER. Have you used any union funds for contributions to Communist causes or Communist-front activities?

(At this point Mr. Michelson conferred with Mr. Sheinberg.)

Mr. MICHELSON. I must decline to answer, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you know of any funds of your union that were used for Communist activities or Communist-front activities?

(At this point Mr. Michelson conferred with Mr. Sheinberg.)

Mr. MICHELSON. I answer that the same way, sir. I decline to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Walter?

Mr. WALTER. I have no questions.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Moulder?

Mr. MOULDER. I want to ask this: What position do you hold in the union now?

Mr. MICHELSON. I am the organizational director of the union, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. How are you selected or elected to that position by your union members?

Mr. MICHELSON. By secret ballot.

Mr. MOULDER. How is the meeting called, or are all members notified of the meeting when they elect officers?

Mr. MICHELSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. When were you last elected?

Mr. MICHELSON. In June of this past year, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. How many members are there in your local union?

Mr. MICHELSON. In the district? As I stated before, about 30,000, sir, and about—I think my figures are accurate—18,000 members of the union voted.

Mr. MOULDER. Can you give an estimate as to what percentage of that membership attended that meeting when you were selected or elected as the organizational manager?

Mr. MICHELSON. Well, the voting did not take place at the meetings. The voting took place at a balloting that was held at union headquarters, and I believe the figure was somewhere between 15,000 and 18,000 members voting in that election.

Mr. CLARDY. Are you through?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Witness, you have refused to tell this committee whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party or ever had been a member of the Communist Party. Have you advised the members of your union as to whether you are a member of the party or not?

(At this point Mr. Michelson conferred with Mr. Sheinberg.)

Mr. MICHELSON. I must exercise the privilege on that question, too, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you ever sign any place an affidavit stating that you were not a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MICHELSON. I must decline to answer on the same grounds, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Were you ever asked that question by members of the union or anyone connected with the organization?

Mr. MICHELSON. I must respectfully decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you sign the non-Communist oath required by the Taft-Hartley Act?

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. MICHELSON. I must decline to answer on the same grounds, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Are you acquainted with anybody who, to your knowledge, is a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MICHELSON. I must decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. CLARDY. Have you ever attended any meetings of the Communist Party?

Mr. MICHELSON. I must decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you know whether or not there are any Communists in the union to which you belong?

Mr. MICHELSON. I must decline to answer on the same grounds, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. What were the other committees before which you have appeared?

(At this point Mr. Michelson conferred with Mr. Sheinberg.)

Mr. MICHELSON. The Kersten committee, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. That is the only one?

Mr. MICHELSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. That is a House committee?

Mr. MICHELSON. It was a House committee, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. When was that hearing, approximately?

Mr. MICHELSON. I would say about 4 or 5 years ago.

Mr. WALTER. Through the 80th Congress?

Mr. MICHELSON. I think it was, sir. I think it was 1947 or 1948.

Mr. CLARDY. At that hearing were you asked the questions that have been propounded here today in substance dealing with your possible Communist connections or activities?

(At this point Mr. Michelson conferred with Mr. Sheinberg.)

Mr. MICHELSON. I don't recollect all of the questions that were asked me in committee.

Mr. CLARDY. I said in substance.

Mr. MICHELSON. I think in substance generally the same questions.

Mr. CLARDY. Did you decline there, as you have here today?

(At this point Mr. Michelson conferred with Mr. Sheinberg.)

Mr. MICHELSON. To the best of my recollection, I did, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. During the interval of those several years between your prior appearance and your appearance here today have you actively engaged in promoting any of the aims and objectives of the Communist Party in any way whatsoever?

Mr. MICHELSON. I must decline to answer, sir, on the same grounds.

Mr. CLARDY. Are you at present on the Communist Party payroll in any sense, either directly or indirectly?

Mr. MICHELSON. I must decline to answer, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you have any further questions, gentlemen?

Mr. KUNZIG. No, sir. I want to make the record clear that when you say, "I must decline to answer," you mean each time you do decline to answer?

Mr. MICHELSON. That is correct.

Mr. CLARDY. I think that is understood. I corrected him a time or two, and counsel understood as we went along by nodding his head that that was the case.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Witness, the Kersten committee before which you testified some years ago, that was a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives;¹ is that right?

¹ This committee, commonly called the Kersten committee, was a subcommittee of the United States House of Representatives' Committee on Education and Labor, of which Hon. Charles J. Kersten, of Wisconsin, was subcommittee chairman, and functioned during the 80th Cong.

Mr. MICHELSON. I think you might be right. I am not sure.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you ever sign any petitions that that committee be abolished?

(At this point Mr. Michelson conferred with Mr. Sheinberg.)

Mr. MICHELSON. I have no such recollection, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. You mean, so far as you now recall, you have not signed such a petition; is that what you mean?

Mr. MICHELSON. That is right, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you have any further question?

Mr. KUNZIG. Nothing, sir, and I suggest this witness be no longer maintained under subpoena and be allowed to leave the building at once.

Mr. CLARDY. You are excused.

Call your next witness.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Andren.

Mr. CLARDY. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. CLARDY. Proceed, counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. Will you please state your name and spell it very clearly?

TESTIMONY OF CARL ANDREN¹ ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, ARTHUR SHEINBERG

Mr. ANDREN. Carl, C-a-r-l, Andren, A-n-d-r-e-n.

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. KUNZIG. I note that you are represented by the same counsel who is already on record.

Mr. CLARDY. That will be shown.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is your address, Mr. Andren?

Mr. ANDREN. 523 East 14th Street, New York City, N. Y.

Mr. KUNZIG. When and where were you born?

Mr. ANDREN. April 29, 1906, in St. Paul, Minn.

(Representative Francis E. Walter left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you give the committee a résumé of your educational background, please, sir.

Mr. ANDREN. I am a high-school graduate.

Mr. KUNZIG. Where and when?

Mr. ANDREN. In St. Paul, Minn., approximately 1925.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you give the committee a résumé of your occupational background?

Mr. ANDREN. I was a men's-wear salesman and a manager of several stores in the Midwest until I came to Chicago in 1931; came to New York in approximately 1935. Then I became a traveling salesman for a little more than a year, and then was employed by Bloomingdale's Department Store in New York as a men's-clothing salesman in 1937. I was employed there until approximately—with a break of a couple of years while I was in the service, I was employed there until 1947 when I was elected as a representative of the Bloomingdale Employees' Union. I have been associated with the union since that time.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is your present position with the union?

¹ The witness, Carl Andren, was sworn in executive session on the same date.

Mr. ANDREN. I am a vice president of district 65, assigned to department stores in New York.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is that the same union as to which there has been testimony prior to this afternoon?

Mr. ANDREN. Yes; it is.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you ever at any time in or about 1933 live in Rockford, Ill.?

Mr. ANDREN. I——

Mr. KUNZIG. I guess not.

Mr. ANDREN. I traced my history step by step; I went from St. Paul to Chicago; from Chicago to New York.

Mr. KUNZIG. So you were not in Rockford, Ill.

Mr. ANDREN. No.

Mr. CLARDY. I was a little puzzled, too. You said something about the Middle West, and coming from there I wondered——

Mr. ANDREN. St. Paul and Chicago are Middle West.

Mr. CLARDY. That is right. I thought you meant to imply, as I think counsel understood, that there may have been some other places that you didn't mention.

Mr. ANDREN. No.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, have you ever been at any time a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ANDREN. I must exercise my privilege under the fifth amendment and decline to answer.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ANDREN. I must exercise my privilege under the fifth amendment and decline to answer.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, you say you must. You mean you do?

Mr. ANDREN. I do; I do; sorry.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have in my hands a copy of the Daily Worker, Friday, April 2, 1948. The headline says "Unionists Back Rights Parley." Parley is held to develop a united-action program on civil rights, sponsored by the Civil Rights Congress and the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. Among those who have endorsed the conference it lists Carl Andren, business agent, Bloomingdale's, Local 3, Department Store Employees' Union. Are you the Carl Andren therein listed?

Mr. ANDREN. I decline under the privilege that I have under the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you a member of the Civil Rights Congress?

(At this point Mr. Andren conferred with Mr. Sheinberg.)

Mr. ANDREN. I decline to answer under my privilege.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you endorsed projects sponsored by the Civil Rights Congress?

Mr. ANDREN. I decline to answer.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have already stated for the record this afternoon on today's record the citations of the Civil Rights Congress and the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.

Mr. CLARDY. You needn't repeat them at this time.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you appear before the Kersten committee about which there has already been interrogation this afternoon?

Mr. ANDREN. Yes; I did.

Mr. KUNZIG. At that time were you asked whether you were a member of the Communist Party, and did you refuse to answer?

Mr. ANDREN. I was asked the same questions in substance that I am being asked here today, which were also part of a threat at that time which exists over my head at this time.

Mr. KUNZIG. So, you refused to answer the questions then, and you refuse to answer the questions now?

Mr. ANDREN. Within the framework of the context in which they are being placed, putting myself in jeopardy to go to jail, which I have been threatened with.

Mr. CLARDY. You are not imputing any such threat to this committee.

Mr. ANDREN. I am not to this committee; no, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Very well.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have here in front of me a clipping from the Washington Star of September 7, 1948, page A-6. The headline is:

"Store Union Ousts 3 Over Non-Communist Oaths." An international union president said yesterday he has suspended three officers of a CIO department store local for refusing to sign non-Communist affidavits. Mr. Wolchok said he ordered the officers' suspension and recommended further action by the parent union. They are Lester Pearson, Samuel Lewis, and Carl W. Andren, business agent.

Are you the Mr. Andren listed in this article?

Mr. MOULDER. Or is he the Mr. Andren referred to by this statement, wouldn't that be better?

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you the Mr. Andren referred to by this statement? (At this point Mr. Andren conferred with Mr. Sheinberg.)

Mr. ANDREN. I will have to exercise my privilege under the fifth amendment and decline to answer.

Mr. CLARDY. Again may I suggest, you mean you are exercising—

Mr. ANDREN. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you suspended from a union because of refusing to sign the non-Communist affidavit required by the Taft-Hartley Act?

(At this point Mr. Andren conferred with Mr. Sheinberg.)

Mr. ANDREN. I am sorry; I must exercise the same privilege.

Mr. KUNZIG. There is no requirement that you do so.

Mr. ANDREN. Well, except that I open the door for lots of questions that I don't know what you are going to ask subsequently, even though many things may be inaccurate.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, witness, each question must stand alone, and you either answer or not answer—

Mr. ANDREN. Except the committee counsel won't let them stand alone.

Mr. CLARDY. May I instruct you that each question stands alone, and you have no right to assume anything with respect to what will follow. Now, as I understand it, you are declining to answer that question.

Mr. ANDREN. Yes; I am.

Mr. KUNZIG. May I state, sir, for the record, that if there should be—and I doubt that there are any—should there be any inaccuracies, the clearest way to get rid of inaccuracies is to answer a question honestly and truthfully and state what the facts are.

Mr. CLARDY. That is the purpose, in part, of this hearing.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you eventually sign the non-Communist affidavit oath as required by the Taft-Hartley Act? May I state that whether

or not he signed is, of course, something that can be checked as a matter of record.

Mr. CLARDY. That is right.

Mr. ANDREN. I think you are aware of who the officers of our union are—there are hundreds of them who have signed, but because of the nature of the question—

Mr. KUNZIG. That wasn't the question.

Mr. ANDREN (continuing). I must decline to answer under the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have here in my hand a photostatic copy of an affidavit of non-Communist union officer, and reading from it, it states:

The undersigned being duly sworn deposes and says: (1) I am a responsible officer of the union named below; (2) I am not a member of the Communist Party or affiliated with such party; (3) I do not believe in, and I am not a member of, nor do I support, any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods.

(At this point Mr. Andren conferred with Mr. Sheinberg.)

Mr. KUNZIG. "District 65, CIO, Distributive, Processing, and Office Workers of America, CIO." Signature, Carl Andren; residence, 13 Astor Place, New York City; dated June 17, 1953.

Mr. CLARDY. What date?

Mr. KUNZIG. 1953.

Mr. CLARDY. June what?

Mr. KUNZIG. June 17, 1953.

Mr. SCHERER. Who is the notary?

Mr. KUNZIG. "Sworn before"—and it looks like G-r-o-i-s-s-e-k or e-r, Grosser it is—commissioner of deeds, city of New York, New York County clerk's No. 164. "My commission expired October 8, 1954."

Mr. CLARDY. Will you exhibit that to the witness?

Mr. KUNZIG. I hand this to you and ask if that is your signature, and if you signed that non-Communist oath, of which photostatic copy is in your hands.

Mr. ANDREN. This is a matter of record for you, and I must decline to answer under the same grounds which I have declined previously.

Mr. KUNZIG. But, Mr. Andren, it is not a matter of record—

Mr. CLARDY. Pardon me, counsel. Witness, because of the fact that this is, as you correctly state, a matter of public record, the Chair now directs that you answer that question. You may consult with your attorney if you wish before you reply.

(At this point Mr. Andren conferred with Mr. Sheinberg.)

Mr. ANDREN. That is my signature.

Mr. KUNZIG. It is your signature.

Mr. SCHERER. Were you telling the truth when you signed that affidavit?

Mr. ANDREN. There you are. That is the kind of a question that I am frightened of in front of this committee because something—some crackpot will come along and make a claim against me and open me for charges of perjury.

Mr. SCHERER. I am merely asking whether or not you told the truth when you were under oath.

Mr. ANDREN. I never tell an untruth.

Mr. SCHERER. Now the question is then, were you telling the truth when you signed that affidavit.

(At this point Mr. Andren conferred with Mr. Sheinberg.)

Mr. ANDREN. I don't want to be difficult with this committee, but at the same time, because of the threats that have been made against me in the recent past, I can't afford to open the door for my going to jail.

Mr. CLARDY. Now, witness, you have indicated that this committee has made no threats, and of course we know that is the fact, that there have been no threats of any kind whatsoever. In fact, I didn't even know about you any more than you knew about me, but you have admitted the signature on the document in question.

Mr. ANDREN. Yes, I did.

Mr. CLARDY. I must tell you now that it is the Chair's order that you do answer the question just propounded to you and to point out to you that unless you do answer, you do place yourself in jeopardy. If you have further need for consultation with counsel, you may do so. I am sure that your attorney, able lawyer that he is, representing you will be able to tell you what I have in mind.

Mr. ANDREN. I think in view of my previous statement regarding the affidavit that I must exercise—I do exercise my right under the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you mean to tell me, Mr. Witness, do you mean to tell this committee, that you admit that you signed an affidavit here saying that you were not a Communist as late as June 17, and that now you refuse to tell this committee whether or not you told the truth in that affidavit?

Mr. MOULDER. Of course, the affidavit speaks for itself. Do you want to offer it in evidence and have it marked as an exhibit?

Mr. CLARDY. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. I want an answer to the question.

Mr. ANDREN. That affidavit can speak for itself as well as do any others I may have signed.

Mr. SCHERER. My question is still unanswered, Mr. Chairman, and I ask that you instruct the witness to answer my question.

Mr. CLARDY. I have so instructed him, Mr. Scherer. I again instruct you.

(At this point Mr. Andren conferred with Mr. Sheinberg.)

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, before you answer, may I point this out to you: If you have, as you admit you have, signed an affidavit averring that as of June 17 this year that you were not then a Communist, we have here now afforded you an opportunity to say to the world that you were not a Communist at that time, and no harm can possibly befall you, unless—unless at the time you signed that affidavit you were telling something that was not true.

The truth cannot hurt you here today if you confess it or tell us that it is the truth.

Now, you consulted with your counsel, and you have an opportunity here to do that which many Communists claim they do not have the privilege of doing; that is, telling the world what the truth may be.

Now, I direct you again to answer that question.

(Representative Francis E. Walter returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. ANDREN. Representative Clardy, I think that you are aware of the fact that I am frightened by this committee and what may flow

from it, and when I answered the question in a direct manner, telling you frankly that this was my signature and that I don't tell untruths, and then to have a question come back at me—was that a truthful statement—it makes me feel that a trap is being set for me because of my association with a strike in New York at this moment, and I frankly don't want to offend this committee, and I think you are well aware of that.

I think the counsel is familiar with my record in the past number of years, and I think he knows what affidavits I have signed. He certainly knows all about our membership and its attitude on the questions he is raising.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Witness, my question is still before you. If you want to decline to answer my question, you have the right to decline to answer it. But you have not answered it one way or the other.

Mr. ANDREN. I am answering it in the same way I did before, that I never tell any untruths.

Mr. MOULDER. May I help? First this should be marked as an exhibit and placed in the record and then reference can be made by interrogation.

Mr. CLARDY. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. I would like to do it.

Mr. MOULDER. I want to call the witness' attention to the fact that isn't his signature. That is a photostatic copy of his signature, isn't that so?

Mr. KUNZIG. It was stated in the beginning, Mr. Chairman, this was a photostatic copy of this whole document.

Mr. CLARDY. That is right. Has it been marked?

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you mark it, please, as Andren exhibit 1 for identification.

(The photostatic copy of the document referred to, affidavit of non-Communist union officer, was marked "Andren Exhibit No. 1" for identification.)

Mr. KUNZIG. I have in my hand a document marked "Andren Exhibit 1" for identification which purports to be a photostatic copy of affidavit of non-Communist union officer, United States of America, National Labor Relations Board. The witness has admitted this is a photostatic copy of his signature, and I now offer this document in evidence as Andren Exhibit No. 1.

Mr. CLARDY. It may be received.

(The photostatic copy of the document previously marked "Andren Exhibit No. 1" for identification was received in evidence as "Andren Exhibit No. 1.")

Mr. MOULDER. Does the witness admit that he did sign the original of which this is a photostatic copy?

Mr. ANDREN. I said this is my signature.

Mr. SCHERER. I still say there has not been an answer to my question. He has a perfect right to claim the fifth amendment to my question, but he hasn't answered my question.

Mr. CLARDY. You are right.

Mr. SCHERER. If he refuses or declines to answer on the ground that it might incriminate him, he has a perfect right to do so, Mr. Chairman, and I won't press it further.

Mr. ANDREN. Congressman, I do exercise my right on your question, I regret to say, under the privileges I have under the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. I have no further question.

Mr. KUNZIG. You have stated that you were frightened to answer in front of this committee. In order that the record may be clear, you were apparently also frightened to answer in front of the Education and Labor Committee in 1948; is that correct?

Mr. ANDREN. For the reasons or the circumstances under which I appeared in 1948 where we had a problem with the department store managements in New York. A committee arrived on the scene, and relating my experiences back to 1948, nothing flowed from them except a lot of bad publicity to demoralize our members.

We are in the midst of an 8-week strike at Hearn's, and I was threatened that a committee would be brought in, and here it is, so I am not at ease here when I have been told that I was going to be thrown in jail if a strike took place.

Mr. KUNZIG. Could it be that the reason you are not at ease is that you have been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ANDREN. I don't become uneasy——

Mr. KUNZIG. Answer the question, please.

Mr. ANDREN. There is another attempt to draw communism in here, and I must exercise my right under the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. We are not hiding behind any attempt to bring communism in. Communism—let's face it—is in here, and we are discussing communism, in case you didn't know it, this afternoon, and that is why you are here.

Mr. CLARDY. That is why you are here, sir.

Mr. ANDREN. I know.

Mr. CLARDY. May I interrupt a moment, counsel?

Witness, just so that we may have a common ground of understanding that this record may be perfectly clear, you are not now attempting to say to the world, are you, that the members of this committee have you in physical fear at this juncture? You are not saying that, are you?

Mr. ANDREN. Well, look——

Mr. CLARDY. Just answer my question fairly. That isn't what you attempt to say, is it?

Mr. WALTER. Let him answer it.

Mr. ANDREN. I don't know any of you gentlemen. I want to respect you. I certainly respect the office for which you have been elected, but my experience causes me to wonder sometimes. Instead of Mr. Greenfield threatening me that a committee is coming into town, I wish this committee with its vast powers of public opinion would end the 8-week-old strike of these employees who aren't asking for a wage increase and want the right to go back to work without even a contract.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, that is somewhat beyond the jurisdiction of this committee.

Mr. ANDREN. I don't know.

Mr. CLARDY. To get back to what I was leading up to, you don't want to publicly leave the impression here that this committee is at this moment in any way intimidating you, do you?

Mr. ANDREN. No; I don't think you are intimidating me, but I don't want this committee to ruin my reputation in New York, either.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, do you not understand that the questions that have been propounded to you are directed toward giving you an

opportunity to clear your name? You have signed an affidavit there, and I confess I am surprised that you will not frankly say, "Yes, I was telling the truth when I signed it." If you do that, you will help yourself immeasurably in this community, and the committee cannot and would not or even think of visiting anything upon you; but, since you decline, there is nothing more that can be done.

Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. ANDREN. Mr. Congressman, may I just add this: That the position I took originally, if the committee were interested in me personally and not relating these questions to others all over the city of New York, then it would be a different story; but I know that most of these questions are loaded, and they related to pointing the finger at members and other individuals, and it is not me who forces me into this position. I think it is the way these committees are conducting themselves and in the process—

Mr. CLARDY. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. We are asking, Mr. Andren, a very, very simple question as to whether you have ever been a member of the Communist Party, and a simple, easy answer would be to open your lips and say "No."

I have here in my hand a copy of the Daily Worker of Monday, September 27, 1948. The headline says:

City Hall Gets Demand It Act on Thompson Assault.

The story says:

Barred from a meeting with Mayor O'Dwyer at City Hall, a delegation of 47 civic, trade-union, political, and religious leaders Friday lodged through the mayor's police aid a demand for a thorough investigation, apprehension, and bringing to justice of the assailants of Robert Thompson, New York State Communist Party chairman—

and among those listed here as being members of this delegation is Carl Andren.

Were you a member of such delegation?

Mr. ANDREN. Never heard of it, and that is why I have to exercise my rights under the fifth amendment.

Mr. CLARDY. Now, there is a frank answer, Witness, the type we have been trying to get from you. If that is the fact that you were misidentified in that, you can clear these things by saying so. As I understand it, it is your answer that this listing is incorrect?

Mr. ANDREN. I have never seen it. I don't know what it is.

Mr. KUNZIG. I will hand it over, marked "Andren Exhibit No. 2" for identification.

I ask you to look at this article and the story and see if you recognize your name as the Carl Andren listed there.

Mr. MOULDER. In other words, your question is whether or not he is the person referred to in the article?

Mr. KUNZIG. That was my first question, yes, original question.

Mr. ANDREN. The name looks like Carl Andrews to me. I don't know what it is.

Mr. KUNZIG. I ask you again the question: Were you a member of this delegation which protested the beating of the New York State Communist Party chairman, Robert Thompson?

Mr. ANDREN. I must exercise my rights under the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. I want to ask you a question that I asked earlier this afternoon, Mr. Andren. There has been discussion that you and others

are attempting to lead this union away from communism. Even the Daily Worker has accused the union of that; and if the union is being led away from communism, and if communism is no longer at issue, then I ask you once more and finally the question, Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ANDREN. Our members have taken a position on the question of communism—

Mr. KUNZIG. That is not the answer to the question. The question is, Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ANDREN. The officers that don't follow the members don't last as officers.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you now a member of the Communist Party, and I will ask that the witness be directed to answer that question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDREN. I will answer that question as I previously have answered it: I exercise my right under the fifth amendment to not answer.

Mr. SCHERER. Do the members of your union know whether you are a member of the Communist Party or not?

(At this point Mr. Andren conferred with Mr. Sheinberg.)

Mr. ANDREN. I don't understand just what the Congressman means.

Mr. SCHERER. You just finished telling us that your members are satisfied with you people, and I want to know—

Mr. ANDREN. I said they have taken a position on the question of communism, and there wouldn't be any officers in our union that would be officers if they didn't live up to the decisions of our members.

Now, you try to ask me a loaded question as to what do I know about what the members think. I presume they have taken these positions, and they can expect their leadership to comply with their decisions.

Mr. SCHERER. All right. Now, you said that I want to know what your members think, and I will ask you this question: Have you ever told the members of your union whether or not you are a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ANDREN. I will answer this in this way: The members of our union don't think that I am a Communist.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are they correct in that assumption?

Mr. ANDREN. There you are asking me another question which I have to use the privileges under the fifth amendment not to answer.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, you don't have to, as I have explained before. You are taking the fifth amendment, however?

Mr. ANDREN. Yes, because I don't know where I am being led.

Mr. KUNZIG. We don't know where you have been. I have no further questions.

Mr. CLARDY. Any further questions?

Witness, you signed an affidavit this year saying that you were, as of that moment, not a member of the Communist Party. Has your status changed since that date?

Mr. ANDREN. Committee counsel could have looked back further and found other affidavits, too.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, that may be so, but just answer my question as to the period since June 17 this year down to and including right now.

Mr. ANDREN. If that was not a truthful statement, the Justice Department will certainly exercise its role.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, you are not answering my question. My question is: Has your status in any way changed as to Communist affiliations since the June 17 date of that affidavit?

(At this point Mr. Andren conferred with Mr. Sheinberg.)

Mr. ANDREN. You are asking the question, as I understood, has my status changed since June 17. The answer is "No".

Mr. CLARDY. So that if you were telling the truth at that time, you are not a Communist at the moment, and if you were not telling the truth at that time, you are still a Communist, that is the impression you want to leave?

Mr. ANDREN. No; I don't want to leave that impression.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, you are sure leaving it.

Do you have any further questions?

Mr. KUNZIG. No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. Any reason this witness should not be excused?

Mr. KUNZIG. No reason.

Mr. CLARDY. The witness is excused.

Call your next witness.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. David Livingston.

Mr. CLARDY. Are you ready, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. KUNZIG. I am.

Would you state your name for the record, please?

TESTIMONY OF DAVID LIVINGSTON,¹ ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, ARTHUR SHEINBERG

Mr. LIVINGSTON. My name is David Livingston, L-i-v-i-n-g-s-t-o-n.

Mr. KUNZIG. Let the record show that I note that the same counsel is here that has been present for the afternoon.

Mr. CLARDY. It will so show.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you state your present address, please, Mr. Livingston.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, would you let my answer in the executive session show for the record here since its publication in the press has in the past caused my family considerable embarrassment? Since you already have my address——

Mr. KUNZIG. My question was, what is this man's address.

Mr. CLARDY. That is what I understood.

Mr. WALTER. That is a reasonable request to be made. We have it.

Mr. CLARDY. We have the address, and it is, of course, easily found, I assume, in the telephone book, anyway.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It is, sir, and besides, I gave it to you a little while ago.

Mr. KUNZIG. When and where were you born?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I was born January 8, 1915, in Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mr. Chairman, before you proceed with the questions, may I make my request to you at this time that these hearings be adjourned until the Hearn's strike is closed——

Mr. KUNZIG. Just a moment, Mr. Chairman. This is already in the record also, and I suggest that this not be repeated because I am sure the witness wouldn't want this said out loud, either.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, you proceed with your questions until the witness has answered a question; we will receive no explanations.

¹ Witness, David Livingston, was sworn in executive session on the same day.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I was making a request to you, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Never mind, witness.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you give the committee a record of your background, your educational background, please?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I went through normal grade and high-school education in New York City and attended college for 3 years.

Mr. KUNZIG. When did you graduate from high school and when from college?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I did not graduate from college.

Mr. KUNZIG. Let us start first, when did you graduate from high school?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. You are really testing my memory. I will have to think back now, just a moment.

Mr. CLARDY. You aren't so very old. I can remember when I did.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The exact year, sir?

Mr. CLARDY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I will have to think back. Let me see—1927, I think, from grade school, public school 128; and 1931 from New Utrecht High School, U-t-r-e-c-h-t.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you give the committee a résumé of your occupational background, your employment, please?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I held various jobs while I was at school, and after I left school I worked as a salesman for a while and as a warehouseman for a while. Then I was elected to office in the union of wholesale and warehouse employees. I remained in that occupation for a number of years and was interrupted only by service in the Armed Forces.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is your present position, Mr. Livingston?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I am secretary-treasurer of the Distributive, Processing and Office Workers of America, CIO.

Mr. KUNZIG. That is here in New York?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is in a number of places throughout the country. It is a national union.

Mr. CLARDY. You hold a national office then?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. In DPOWA I hold a national office. I also hold a local office here in New York.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, I have here in front of me a document entitled, "Photostatic Copy of Pages From the Young Communist League 1938 Yearbook" in which, under a headline, "Branch Stalwarts" is a picture under which is the name David Livingston: New York State Young Communist League, 1938 yearbook. I pass this to you and ask whether you are the David Livingston whose picture appears on those pages.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I would decline to answer that question on the grounds that the question is in violation of my rights under the fifth amendment of the constitution.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you decline? You said, "I would decline." Do you decline to answer?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I certainly do decline to answer that question.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you want that marked as an exhibit?

Mr. KUNZIG. There are a whole group. We haven't been following the—

Mr. CLARDY. I didn't know if you wanted that one specifically.

Mr. WALTER. When did your union go back to the CIO?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The exact date I don't recall. It was somewhere between the 10th and 15th of May of this year.

Mr. WALTER. Was that before or after the convention at Atlantic City?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It was—by the “convention at Atlantic City” do you mean the conference in Atlantic City which arranged for our affiliation with CIO?

Mr. WALTER. Is that what it was? I thought it was a national convention.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes. In the early part of May of this year we held a meeting of our executive board of DPOWA; simultaneously the executive board of the Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union, CIO, met and an agreement was reached by which the two unions would merge, and pursuant to that agreement we were readmitted into CIO and are now proud members of CIO.

Mr. CLARDY. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. I shall ask you directly, have you ever been a member of the Young Communist League?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I believe that question violates my rights under the fifth amendment, and I decline to answer.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party, Mr. Livingston?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I believe that that question violates my rights under the fifth amendment, and I decline to answer.

Mr. KUNZIG. You just stated that your union is a proud member of the CIO. Let me ask you the question, are you now—I am talking about at this time—a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Well, you have put two things together—I am sorry, I don't know your name or how to address you. Do I say “counsel”?

Mr. KUNZIG. That will be perfectly all right.

(Representative Gordon H. Scherer returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. You put two things together. We are proud members of the CIO, and I say unhesitatingly we are loyal to the principles, programs and practices of the CIO.

Mr. KUNZIG. Answer the second part.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. In which you ask me whether I personally am a member of the Communist Party. I decline to answer under the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have here a photostatic copy of the Daily Worker, February 24, 1942. We will go up through the years and see your activity.¹

Youth Parley to Free Browder Speeds Drive.

“Students, labor, fraternity, and civic groups press unity in campaign”—

and it is a campaign to have Earl Browder freed from prison—

Jack McMichael, National Chairman of the American Youth Congress, told a youth conference on Earl Browder at this date.

Other speakers at this conference included David Livingston, vice president of local 65, United Wholesale and Warehouse Workers, CIO.

Are you the David Livingston therein listed in this issue of the Daily Worker?

¹ Refers to Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I believe that that question infringes upon my rights under the fifth amendment, and I decline to answer.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you attend a parley, a conference, to free Earl Browder in February of 1942?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I believe that that question violates my rights under the fifth amendment, and I decline to answer.

Mr. KUNZIG. The American Youth Congress, for the record, Mr. Chairman, has been cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark in letters to the Loyalty Review Board of 1947 and of 1948.

"It originated in 1934 and has been controlled by Communists and manipulated by them to influence the thought of American youth," said Attorney General Francis Biddle in the Congressional Record of September 24, 1942.

"One of the principal fronts of the Communist Party' and 'prominently identified with the White House picket line under the immediate auspices of the American Peace Mobilization;'" Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1942; also cited in 1939, 1941, and 1944.

The California Committee and the Massachusetts Committee also cited this group. It was cited in 1943 by the special subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, and cited as a Communist front by the Pennsylvania Commonwealth Counsel in January 1942.

(Representative Gordon H. Scherer returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. KUNZIG. I have here a photostatic copy of the proceedings of the New York Model Legislature of Youth, January 28 to 30, 1938, sponsored by the American Youth Congress, and listed as among the members of the presiding committee is Dave Livingston, United Wholesale Employees of New York. Are you the Dave Livingston therein listed?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I believe that that question infringes on my rights under the fifth amendment to the Constitution, and I decline to answer it.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have another article from Review, published weekly by the New Age Publishers for the Young Communist League which also talks about speeding the youth drive to free Browder and also lists one Dave Livingston. I won't ask that same question again.

I have here a letterhead of the American Youth for Democracy, 13 Astor Place, room 607, New York 3. The letter is dated—this particular letter—November 11, 1943. On the letterhead as acting president of American Youth for Democracy is David Livingston. Are you the David Livingston therein listed?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I still believe that that question violates my rights under the fifth amendment, and I decline to answer.

Mr. KUNZIG. For the record, Mr. Chairman, the American Youth for Democracy has been cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark in 1947 and 1948 and was cited as the new name under which the Young Communist League operated and which also largely absorbed the American Youth Congress in the Special Committee on Un-American Activities report, in 1944.

It was cited by this committee—

as a front formed in 1943 to succeed the Young Communist League and for the purpose of exploiting to the advantage of a foreign power the idealism, inexperience, and craving to join which is characteristic of American college youth.

Its high-sounding slogans cover a determined effort to disaffect our youth and to turn them against religion, the American home, against the college authorities, and against the American Government itself.

That is a 1947 citation. It was also cited by the California committee.

Here is a further article from the Daily Worker, October 18, 1943, concerning American Youth for Democracy formed at an organizing convention initiated by the Young Communist League, and this is a story in the Daily Worker, and it lists David Livingston. It says that a vote of thanks was extended to David Livingston for his work as chairman pro tem during the afternoon session.

Are you the David Livingston who was chairman pro tem at that time?

MR. LIVINGSTON. I believe that that question is an infringement upon my rights under the fifth amendment, and I decline to answer it.

MR. KUNZIG. Were you a member of the American Youth for Democracy?

MR. LIVINGSTON. I would make the same answer to that question, sir.

MR. KUNZIG. Now I have here a very unusual exhibit which is an exhibit from a dinner meeting called "Welcome Home, Joe Dinner"—a salute to those who serve in the fight for a better world—on the occasion of the second anniversary of American Youth for Democracy; Hotel Roosevelt, New York, December 12, 1945, and listed as chairman, the New York State Office of American Youth for Democracy, is Cpl. David Livingston, chairman, and then in parentheses it says, ("In the United States Armed Forces,") close of parentheses.

Were you chairman of the American Youth for Democracy at that time?

MR. LIVINGSTON. May I see that, please?

MR. KUNZIG. Certainly.

MR. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, this is a perfect example of why a witness is in the position of having to decline to answer these things.

MR. CLARDY. Do you decline to answer the question?

MR. LIVINGSTON. May I make this answer, please—

MR. CLARDY. Not until you tell us whether or not—

MR. LIVINGSTON. I am going to decline to answer the question, and I would like to give an explanation, if I may.

MR. CLARDY. Not unless you answer. If you answer the question one way or the other you may give any explanation you want.

MR. LIVINGSTON. I am going to decline to answer it, and I would beg leave of the Chairman to give you an explanation as to why I decline.

MR. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the witness be permitted to make the explanation he desires to make.

(At this point Mr. Livingston conferred with Mr. Sheinberg.)

MR. CLARDY. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

MR. LIVINGSTON. Does that mean my request is denied, sir?

MR. CLARDY. I denied your request before you had a conference. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

MR. MOULDER. I want to make my statement for the record that I think the witness is entitled to make the explanation he desires to make.

MR. CLARDY. Not under these circumstances.

MR. MOULDER. I say that is my opinion.

MR. CLARDY. I understand.

Mr. WALTER. I am just wondering if that exhibit ought to be made a part of this record, because it contains the names of people I don't think ought to be placed in the position where we could be charged with smearing people.

Mr. KUNZIG. We can make it part of the record very easily.

Mr. SCHERER. Didn't you say not make it part of the record?

Mr. KUNZIG. What did you say?

Mr. WALTER. I say I don't think that that exhibit should be made a part of this record.

Mr. CLARDY. It isn't.

Mr. SCHERER. I think if it isn't going to be made a part of the record, it should be withdrawn.

Mr. CLARDY. You are not offering that as an exhibit, as I understand.

Mr. KUNZIG. No.

Mr. CLARDY. I asked you about the first document, and you didn't care to offer it, and as I understand it, you have not offered any of the others on which you have interrogated; am I right?

Mr. KUNZIG. No; I have not, because there are no answers on them.

Mr. CLARDY. None of them are in the record.

Mr. KUNZIG. There have been no answers by this witness.

Mr. CLARDY. There have been no answers on most of them, and you have not offered any of them as exhibits.

Mr. KUNZIG. There were 1 or 2 on previous witnesses.

Mr. CLARDY. I am talking about this one.

Mr. KUNZIG. Not on this one.

Mr. CLARDY. None of that is in the record.

Mr. KUNZIG. It has not been offered as an official record; no, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. That is the basis for my declination, coupled with his refusal to answer your question. Since it is not in the record, I do not care to have it expanded on.

Proceed.

(At this point Mr. Livingston conferred with Mr. Sheinberg.)

Mr. KUNZIG. He refused to answer the question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. It isn't in the record.

Mr. KUNZIG. He refused to answer any questions.

I have here a copy of the Daily Worker, page 5, April 4, 1946, headlined "Hickam Field to Washington," picture marked "Livingston, leader of GI demonstration, now leads 'Win the Peace delegation.'" The story goes, "It is just a stone's throw from Hawaii's Hickam Field to Washington, D. C., in global politics, but Dave Livingston, union organizer, former Army sergeant, one of the leaders of the GI demonstrations in Hawaii last January, is on his way to Win the Peace Conference in Washington this weekend."

Mr. CLARDY. What is the date again?

Mr. KUNZIG. April 4, 1946. Were you, as this paper seems to indicate, a leader of the GI demonstrations in Hawaii at that period of time?

(At this point Mr. Livingston conferred with Mr. Sheinberg.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Counsel, there were at least three parts to that question. I am not quite sure what you are asking me.

Mr. CLARDY. He just asked you one, as to whether you were one of the participants in that demonstration.

Mr. KUNZIG. I asked you only one question: Were you one of the leaders in the GI demonstrations in Hawaii? That was the question.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I will decline to answer that question.

Mr. CLARDY. Same ground?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes, sir; on the ground that the question is a violation of my rights under the fifth amendment which protects me both as to an innocent and guilty answer. I think that ought to be made clear. It should not be assumed that because I decline to answer it that the answer that I might give would convict me or subject me to some improper action.

The fifth amendment is for the protection of both the innocent and the guilty. It has been suggested here that a refusal to answer implies that there is something to be hidden. That is not necessarily the fact.

Mr. CLARDY. We will leave that up to the public, but the hour grows late. You may merely say "on the same grounds," and that will shorten it up. Proceed, counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you attend the Win-the-Peace Conference in Washington in 1946?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I would decline to answer that question because I believe it is a violation of my rights under the fifth amendment.

Did you say I could say "on the same grounds"?

Mr. CLARDY. Yes, if you do; and you will have the advantage of all of that.

Mr. KUNZIG. For the record, Mr. Chairman, the National Committee to Win the Peace has been cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark in 1947 and 1948 and also by the California committee.

I have here the Daily Worker, Monday, October 7, 1946, and the story is that

SIXTY LABOR, CIVIC LEADERS DEFEND COMMUNIST PARTY BALLOT RIGHTS

On the eve of the reopening of the court suit to bar the Communist Party from the New York State ballot, 60 labor and liberal leaders yesterday condemned the drive conducted by reactionary Democratic leaders against minority party electoral rights as an assault on the American principle of free elections

and listed in the group protesting is David Livingston, director of organization, Local 65, URWEDSEA-CIO.

Mr. CLARDY. May I see that?

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you the David Livingston therein listed in this article?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I have to see the article, if I may.

Mr. CLARDY. I will let you see it in just a moment.

It is a capital "D." I thought maybe it was a small one.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Sir, I don't remember this particular deal. I will say this: I believe to this moment the Communist Party appears on the ballot. I think if I were asked, I would generally be for the right of almost anybody to be on the ballot who lives up to the laws of the country, so it might have been, but I don't particularly recall it.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you be for the right of the Communist Party today to be on the ballot?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I don't have to be for or against it. It is as a matter of fact on the ballot. It is still regarded as a legal party, I believe.

Mr. CLARDY. That is one reason we have endeavored to tell witness after witness that a frank answer that they belong to the Communist Party—if in fact that they do—will not subject them to any criminal action whatever, and that is why, speaking now for myself, I am utterly unconvinced when somebody takes the fifth amendment that they are doing so in good faith if it is based merely upon the fact that they may belong to the Communist Party, because it is not, unfortunately, a crime to belong to that party as of today.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. In response to what you said, sir, let me tell you what happened to me before the McCarran committee.

Mr. CLARDY. Never mind about that. You can tell me off the record.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Since you address the remarks to me—it will take me 2 seconds.

Mr. CLARDY. You will be able to tell me after it is over, because I would like to talk with you.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you ever given lectures for the George Washington Carver School?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. What is the George Washington Carver School, counsel?

Mr. KUNZIG. I will pass over to you a brochure of the George Washington Carver School—"is proud to present a series of lectures by leading trade unionists entitled 'Labor and Politics,' and there is one listing "Organizing the Unorganized" by Dave Livingston, February 24.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. What year is that?

Mr. KUNZIG. If that doesn't convince you, here is another one.

Mr. CLARDY. May I see it, witness, when you are finished?

Does it have a year on it?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No; telephone number and address.

Mr. KUNZIG. If your memory needs refreshing, here is one dated George Washington Carver School, winter term, 1947. There is "Livingston, Dave; lecturer on labor and politics, organization director, Local 65, Wholesale and Warehouse Workers Union." Look at that and see if that refreshes your memory.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Counsel, as a general policy I decline to answer any questions having to do with organizations having been described as subversive. If this is one of them, I will make the same declaration. If you tell me that it is not, I will be glad to give you the facts as to whether I ever lectured before this George Washington Carver School; but if it is on the subversive list, I decline to answer.

Mr. KUNZIG. In order that you may have the protection which this committee certainly wants to afford, the George Washington Carver School was cited as an adjunct in New York City of the Communist Party by Attorney General Tom Clark in 1947.

I presume now you wish to take the fifth amendment.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I decline to answer anything in connection with organizations that have been labeled "subversive" because if you answer it, you are subjecting yourself to an easy frame by a lying stool pigeon which has already happened to me, and it is not going to happen again, I assure you.

Mr. KUNZIG. Here I have before me the same document that we presented earlier this afternoon of the Civil Rights Congress, which is a call to a conference for abolition of the Un-American Activities Committee, and the program of the conference lists under labor leaders speaking, David Livingston, organizational director, Local 65, URWEDSEA.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Who called that conference?

Mr. KUNZIG. The Civil Rights Congress of New York, which, in case you have forgotten, is an organization which has certainly been designated as subversive.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Anything having to do with organizations on the subversive lists, even if I had never heard of them I would decline to answer, and I certainly decline to answer this question.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, let me just ask you then, so we get it straight for the record: Are you the David Livingston who is listed on the program of a conference at Manhattan Center, October 11, 1947, speaking against the House Committee on Un-American Activities, as sponsored by the Civil Rights Congress of New York?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I don't want to fence with you. I am not responsible for what people list. I don't know what they are talking about. If you want to know whether I ever participated in a Civil Rights Congress affair, my answer is, since the Civil Rights Congress appears on the subversive list, any answer to that question, even if I had nothing to do with it, might endanger me, and I choose to exercise my rights under the fifth amendment—period.

Mr. CLARDY. How many more do you have there, counsel?

Mr. KUNZIG. There are quite a large group here.

Mr. CLARDY. Is it necessary that we go down through the remaining ones? It is getting pretty close to 4 o'clock.

Mr. KUNZIG. Maybe, Mr. Chairman, we could take at this stage perhaps a 5-minute break, if you would be so kind as to permit it, and we could perhaps finish this particular witness very quickly.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, is there any reason why we can't finish first and then take the break?

Mr. KUNZIG. There is.

Mr. CLARDY. You make that request?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Very well. We will take a 5-minute recess.

(Thereupon a short recess was taken.)

Mr. CLARDY. The hearing will be in order.

Are you ready, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. Chairman, I have a large additional number of documents which, because of the lateness of the afternoon, I just wish to state for the record are documents all listing the name of this witness, and all listing organizations or front organization which have been listed as subversive by either the Attorney General or this committee or both. There are just a few more I would like to mention specifically.

I have here a copy of the Daily Worker of July 19, 1949, with a story, "Labor rally to mark the year of the frameup of the 12"—referring to the trial of the Communist leaders, of course, and one of the speakers at this was a David Livingston, vice president, local 65. Are you the David Livingston therein mentioned?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. May I see the article? Mr. Counsel, I accept no responsibility for what appears in the Daily Worker.

Mr. KUNZIG. Can you explain why your name appears there so frequently?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Can you explain what the Daily Worker does? I can't.

Mr. KUNZIG. I thought maybe you could better than I.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I don't know; maybe you can do it better than I can. I accept no responsibility for it.

Mr. CLARDY. If both of you will pardon me, let us get back to the question. The question again, counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. I will then reframe the question at this time and ask you whether you participated in a "labor rally to mark the year of the frameup of the 12," as stated here along with Ben Gold, president of CIO Fur and Leather Workers Union, and other well-known people.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Well, like many other organizations, without accepting any responsibility for words like "frameup" and "year's anniversary" and what not, the CIO and numerous other people expressed concern about the Smith Act per se, and I was undoubtedly amongst them. But as to whether I ever appeared in this particular rally in the company you listed, I would have to claim my privilege.

Mr. CLARDY. You decline to answer, then?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That specific question; yes, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Proceed, counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. "New York unions pledge drive to free Bridges," Daily Worker, April 17, 1950. The story says, again in this Daily Worker—for which, of course, you take no responsibility; I realize you didn't put your name in it, but it says:

An initial \$1,000 was pledged for the freedom drive for Bridges by David Livingston, local 65, Wholesale and Warehouse Workers.

Did you pledge a thousand dollars in this freedom drive?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, if these questions could be separated from the Worker and some of their language—

Mr. KUNZIG. The question is very simple.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I phrase like "freedom drive"—I forget what that means. We did make a contribution to the legal defense of Mr. Bridges.

I am perfectly free to say that.

Mr. CLARDY. That answers it. Whether it was \$1,000 is immaterial.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Whether it was a freedom drive, as the Worker says, I can't accept responsibility for that or answer it.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you use union funds to work for the freedom of Bridges?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. None of the funds of the union are usable by officers as such. This particular contribution you speak of was contributions made by members turned into the union and turned over by the union to the Bridges' defense.

Mr. CLARDY. Over and above the normal union dues or assessment?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Having nothing to do with union dues as a voluntary matter. I would like to say, since Mr. Michelson gave an in-

exact answer to that question or declined to answer a similar question, that none of the funds of the union are used for any other purpose except union business and by specific decision of the members. Not a single penny has ever been diverted for Communist causes or any other causes of union funds.

Mr. CLARDY. If the union membership under skillful leadership of Communist leaders decides to donate to the Communist cause, then it is done; isn't it?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Do you really think that is a fair question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. CLARDY. No; I think that is a statement of fact.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It includes a lot of loaded words like "skilled," et cetera.

Mr. KUNZIG. Let us just ask you this: If the books and records and everything are so clear, could you explain to the committee why you spent 3 months in jail for defying a grand jury and refusing to turn over your books and records?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I would be glad to do that, sir. In the first place, I did not spend 3 months in the jail, but exactly a night and a half, a very unpleasant night and a half, may I add.

Mr. CLARDY. Where was this?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. This Federal district.

Mr. CLARDY. Here?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes; I will be glad to explain what happened.

Mr. KUNZIG. You were sentenced to 3 months; were you not?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes, we were.

Mr. KUNZIG. We are anxious to get an explanation.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. What happened was that a demand was made for our books and records and membership lists. As a matter of principle it seemed to us that those were privileged records which had been turned over to us by our members and that we should not make them available to anybody.

We believed it was a violation of the fourth amendment, and we refused to turn over the books.

Mr. SCHERER. A Federal judge thought otherwise; didn't he?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes, we had a difference of opinion with the judge.

Mr. SCHERER. The same as you have with this committee.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I don't believe I have a difference of opinion with this committee.

If you would let me give an explanation, you would find yourself in complete agreement with it.

Mr. CLARDY. Anyway, the judge won out in the first round.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes, on the first round. What happened was that—

Mr. CLARDY. Who was the judge?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Irving Kaufman.

The judge denied bail, and an appeal was taken by our attorneys to the circuit court, and Judge Learned Hand was sitting and was indignant at the denial of bail, and he called upon the Government attorney—"What can happen to this country if this man is released on bail?"—

Mr. CLARDY. Were you released then?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Let me complete the story.

Mr. CLARDY. Just answer the question: Were you released?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes, yes. What happened was that the United States attorney then made a claim that \$80,000 of the union's money had been given to the Communists, the fugitives that got away, you know—the union's money. When I heard that, I said, "If that is what you are looking for gentlemen, we will give you everything. See if you find 1 cent that was put up for the bail for the Communists," and the grand jury then took our books, made an exhaustive and exhausting examination. They did not find 1 cent given for bail or any other possible diversion of union funds, and I think it all turned out for the best because it cleared the air of all the nonsense about our union's funds being the plaything of the Kremlin and other such nonsense that had just been dished out.

Mr. SCHERER. You have special drives to get these funds, don't you?

Mr. CLARDY. Outside of the union?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Which funds do you mean?

Mr. SCHERER. This thousand dollars, for instance, that you admitted was spent, that was gotten from union members; wasn't it?

Mr. KUNZIG. For Bridges.

Mr. SCHERER. He was a Communist. You said it came from union members.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It is a fact that various members of our union contributed funds for Bridges' defense because they believed being prosecuted was based upon his leadership in the union. They may have been right or wrong.

Mr. SCHERER. Some officer had gone out and solicited those funds?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No; it doesn't work that way actually.

Mr. SCHERER. You mean he put pressure on instead of soliciting—

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I do not mean he put pressure on, and I think that is a very unfair question, if I may say so. There is nothing to suggest members are pressured. If you find a union which is more democratic and more freely expresses the will of its members, I would like you to name it. Our members do not do things under pressure, but under their own consent and because they believe it is the right thing to do.

Mr. CLARDY. May I interpose something to kind of cool the atmosphere?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Surely.

Mr. CLARDY. May I suggest that your lucid explanation of this incident that was suggested by counsel's question has probably served a good purpose, from your standpoint as well as from ours, and that is what I had in mind earlier. The truth can never hurt anyone. That is why I urged you earlier—Do you have any more explanation or have you finished the explanation as to that incident?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I have finished the explanation as to that incident.

Mr. CLARDY. I have given you a privilege that is rarely accorded witnesses before this committee. I hope you appreciate that.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I certainly do.

Mr. CLARDY. Will you proceed.

Mr. SCHERER. I still want to know how they got the thousand dollars. I said "solicited" and he didn't agree with that; so I thought maybe it was pressured.

Mr. CLARDY. He says "No."

Mr. SCHERER. I understand that. I want to know. It wasn't solicited, and it wasn't pressured; so, then I get a lecture, and I want to know how it did happen.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Shall I answer?

Mr. SCHERER. Yes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I didn't object, I don't think, to the word "solicit."

Mr. SCHERER. You certainly did.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Let me tell you what happened.

Mr. CLARDY. Make it short because it is getting late.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I will make it as short as I can, but not at the expense of the truth.

Mr. CLARDY. Oh, I wouldn't want that.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. We have a big organization with thousands of members, and we are not ill-equipped financially, and we get scores and scores and scores of requests for financial assistance of all kinds.

Mr. CLARDY. Just like Congressmen.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Maybe even worse.

Mr. WALTER. Couldn't be.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I concede, Congressman, yours is probably worse. Anyway, what we do—

Mr. SCHERER. Not for Communist causes, though. Go ahead.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I wouldn't be surprised if some Congressmen haven't on occasions gotten requests for others.

What we do as a matter of practice, we inform our members of all of these requests. We get requests from charitable organizations and religious organizations and labor organizations and all kinds, and we inform our members of the requests that have come in, and we leave it up to them.

Last year, as a matter of fact, what we did—because they had so many requests we decided to say to our members this: "Let us have one collection a year. When you turn in money, you say where you want it to go and wherever you want it to go, that is where we will turn it over."

This year the bulk of the money went to the Greater New York Fund, Catholic Charity, NAACP, and other similar organizations, and a great deal of money went to the assistance of Israel, but wherever the members want the money to go it is sent.

Mr. KUNZIG. That fits in, Mr. Chairman, with my next question.

Mr. SCHERER. I want to know how they got the thousand dollars for the defense of Bridges.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. In the course of informing our members of various requests that had been made, we advised them that amongst the requests was a request to assist in the defense of Mr. Bridges. When our members became acquainted with the fact that such a request had been made, some of them chose to turn money over to us which in turn was turned over to the Bridges defense.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you hold all these connections with these Communist-front organizations when making that—

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Congressman, there is no—

Mr. SCHERER. Let me finish the question. Did you make the request that some money ought to be donated to the Bridges defense?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Let me answer your question in two parts. The first part of your question was did I hold all these connections with Communist organizations—

Mr. SCHERER. I said "Communist-front."

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Let me say that my declining to answer questions in connection with these Communist fronts should not be taken by you as an admission that I had the connection, but only that having it or not might endanger me, and I chose to exercise my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. May not be taken by me, but has been.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I think you are in error if you do and unfair to me and in violation of my rights if you make that assumption.

Mr. WALTER. Taken by itself I would agree with you, but there is abundant evidence that what Mr. Scherer says is correct. There are a number of people who have testified as to your activities.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I have never heard this testimony, and I simply say to you, sir, that my declining to answer questions should not, under the interpretation of our Constitution as I understand it—and as the finest legal talent has told us—a declination does not mean that you are guilty of action which you are hiding, but only that, innocent or guilty, you choose to decline for your own protection.

If that were not true, the fifth amendment would be the very opposite; it would mean if you exercised the fifth amendment you are admitting guilt. I am not admitting any such guilt, and I do believe that—

Mr. WALTER. Of course, you don't realize the fifth amendment applies only to people testifying against themselves in a criminal proceedings.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Granted, sir.

Mr. WALTER. This isn't a criminal proceedings.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Granted, but it does mean this: Mr. Budenz testified before the McCarran committee, and he said—

Mr. CLARDY. Pardon, witness. We have heard both sides of this argument quite a few times.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. All right; very well, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. The hour is late, and I agree with my fellow Congressman here. He is, I think, more nearly correct than you are, but will you go ahead.

Mr. KUNZIG. One final question, if I may. I have here the Daily Worker of Monday, April 13, 1953, which has an article "Distributive Union Parley O. K.'s Move To Enter CIO," and it says:

Negotiations looking toward affiliation of the Distributive, Processing, and Office Workers with the CIO or its merger with other CIO unions were unanimously approved by delegates to the union's convention held over the weekend.

It goes on:

Several days before the convention there was a report by David Livingston, who was later named secretary-treasurer of the DPO—

and so forth. The article goes on to say:

The resolution submitted by the administration also said, "We love our country and oppose communism," in line with the general tone set by DPO's leaders to prove to the CIO the union is "worthy" of admission into its ranks.

In other words, suggesting, as I have in earlier questions today, that there is an attempt to lead this union away from any Communist activities. In line with that statement I want to ask you once again, Mr. Livingston, to answer honestly and frankly the question: Are you today a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Counsel, your union is absolutely free——

Mr. KUNZIG. That is not the question. I asked you one simple question. Are you, Mr. David Livingston, today a member of the Communist Party? That is the question.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, that question was preceded by a lengthy question and quotation.

Mr. CLARDY. The question is separated now from that. Just answer yes or no or decline.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. May I assume my answer to the question about myself will not rebound on the statements made about our affiliation with the CIO and the non-Communist character of our union?

Mr. CLARDY. The question has no connection with that whatever, and counsel very carefully severed the two. The question now is, and I will rephrase it and put it as my own: Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. For the reasons I have previously given, sir, I decline to answer that question.

Mr. KUNZIG. No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you have any further questions, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. No; I have no further questions.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Walter?

Mr. WALTER. No.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Moulder?

Mr. MOULDER. No.

Mr. CLARDY. Is there any reason the witness should not be excused from the subpoena at this time?

Mr. KUNZIG. No reason.

Mr. CLARDY. You are excused, witness.

Mr. KUNZIG. We have three more witnesses, Mr. Chairman, and I believe that counsel who represents all three—as he has the previous three—has a recommendation or suggestion to make to this committee.

Mr. CLARDY. All right; we will break precedent and permit you to tell us what is on your mind.

Mr. SHEINBERG. Thank you, sir. In the interests of shortening this hearing, if possible, I would be prepared to stipulate on behalf of the remaining three witnesses that the answers to the general category of questions asked of the three preceding witnesses would be of the same same nature, and that the invocation of the privileges under the fifth amendment would likewise be claimed or invoked.

Mr. CLARDY. Counsel, may I ask you a question?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you have here files similar to those that you have exhibited on the first three witnesses?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, sir; I do. I would like to suggest, however, that the three witnesses at least be called and brought before the committee so we will know they are here.

Mr. CLARDY. We will place them under oath, identify them, and dispense with further formalities and accept counsel's statement.

Mr. KUNZIG. May we call them all at the same time, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. CLARDY. Yes; I suggest that.

Mr. KUNZIG. Peter Stein, Jack Paley, and Arthur Osman.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. OSMAN. I do.

Mr. PALEY. I do.

Mr. STEIN. I do.

**TESTIMONY OF ARTHUR OSMAN, JACK PALEY, AND PETER STEIN,
ACCOMPANIED BY THEIR COUNSEL, ARTHUR SHEINBERG**

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Arthur Osman, would you step forward?

Mr. OSMAN. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Osman, so we get your name and official title correctly on the record, your name is Arthur Osman; is that correct?

Mr. OSMAN. That is right.

Mr. KUNZIG. O-s-m-a-n?

Mr. OSMAN. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is your address?

Mr. OSMAN. I would appreciate it if the address were taken in executive session. We have been molested every time there was such a hearing.

Mr. CLARDY. Do we have his address?

Mr. OSMAN. I will give it if you want it—

Mr. KUNZIG. We would like the address, and the committee always before has required the address to be given.

Mr. OSMAN. I will give it to him, but don't ask me to call it out loud.

Mr. CLARDY. It will be part of the record no matter how you give it.

Mr. OSMAN. But it won't be published until the record has been issued.

Mr. CLARDY. The Chair has no alternative but to order you to answer the question.

Mr. OSMAN. It is a very unfair alternative.

Mr. CLARDY. No, it is not, and I do not care to have you address the Chair in that fashion.

Mr. OSMAN. I did not say that the Chair is unfair, but the action has an unfair result. The last time we had such an experience we had some windows broken.

Mr. CLARDY. The time is short. I must interrupt you. Answer the question.

Mr. OSMAN. 2272 East 28th Street, Brooklyn.

Mr. CLARDY. What is next?

Mr. KUNZIG. Then since the counsel has stated that the answers will be similar, I will not go through this pile of evidence, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. No, do not.

Mr. KUNZIG. I shall just ask the one single question, are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MOULDER. Or have you ever been?

Mr. KUNZIG. I am sorry; I should ask two questions. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. OSMAN. I decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. OSMAN. Same answer.

Mr. CLARDY. Proceed to the next one.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Jack Paley.

Your name is Jack Paley?

Mr. PALEY. Yes.

Mr. SHEINBERG. May I give counsel the address of Mr. Paley? He has a family and small children, and it will work a serious hardship on an innocent family—it is 20 Cherry Avenue, New Rochelle. Would you accept that?

Mr. CLARDY. That is something, counsel, again normally that we do not do; we do not even permit counsel to address the committee. These are unusual circumstances, but that is something that has not been done, and as counsel suggests, it would be setting a precedent.

Mr. SHEINBERG. May I state it, 20 Cherry Avenue, New Rochelle.

Mr. PALEY. Congressman, I have been molested, and my family. I have small children, and we have been molested by some hoodlums; my wife suffered a nervous breakdown, and we had to move out. We are in a new home now. I would appreciate it. I will give my address in executive session.

Mr. SHEINBERG. I have the address right here.

Mr. PALEY. I would like to keep it out of the press if possible.

Mr. CLARDY. Proceed.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Paley, are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. PALEY. I refuse to answer on the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you ever been at any time a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. PALEY. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Peter Stein, P-e-t-e-r S-t-e-i-n?

Mr. STEIN. That is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is your address, Mr. Stein?

Mr. STEIN. 1146 Ogden Avenue in the Bronx.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you now a member of the Communist Party, Mr. Stein?

Mr. STEIN. I decline to answer that on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you ever at any time been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. STEIN. I decline to answer that on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman, of these three witnesses.

Mr. CLARDY. Is there any reason they should not be excused from the subpoenas?

Mr. KUNZIG. I have no reason, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. The witnesses are excused.

Mr. SHEINBERG. May I, as counsel, express my sincere appreciation to the committee for the many courtesies shown to my clients and to myself in this hearing.

Mr. CLARDY. We have broken a lot of precedents, and it is a delight to break this one and allow you to say that.

Mr. SHEINBERG. Thank you.

Mr. CLARDY. There will be a few minutes' recess, and the next hearing will be in executive session.

(Whereupon the public hearing adjourned at 4:25 p. m., and the subcommittee went into executive session, Representatives Gordon H. Scherer, Kit Clardy, Francis E. Walter, and Morgan M. Moulder being present.)

EXECUTIVE SESSION ¹

Mr. CLARDY. Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I do.

(Representative Gordon H. Scherer left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you state your name, please, for the record?

TESTIMONY OF HERBERT A. PHILBRICK

Mr. PHILBRICK. My name is Herbert A. Philbrick, P-h-i-l-b-r-i-c-k.

Mr. CLARDY. Author of I Led Three Lives; that is in my library.

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Philbrick, I see, of course—it is most unnecessary to state—that you are unaccompanied by counsel, but I take it you prefer to testify without counsel?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes; I do.

Mr. KUNZIG. I wanted the record to show that. What is your address, sir.

Mr. PHILBRICK. My address is 21 Vermont Avenue, White Plains, N. Y.

Mr. KUNZIG. I note, of course, that you have testified before this committee previously, and we have records to that effect. Therefore the typical background questions and material of that nature, questions of that nature, would not be necessary to ask.

Briefly, as I understand, you did act as undercover agent for the FBI for a period of 9 years; is that correct, sir?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes; it is.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is your present occupation, Mr. Philbrick?

Mr. PHILBRICK. At the present time I am working for the New York Herald Tribune in New York, a member of the advertising staff of the paper. Also I write a Sunday column for the Tribune called The Red Underground.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Philbrick, the purpose for which we have asked you to come before the committee today is to give us the benefit and knowledge of your experience with regard to any possible individuals whom you might know or might have evidence about who were involved in a conspiracy of the Communist Party among the clergy. We are interested, of course, only in individuals as they may have an effect in this vitally important field.

Mr. Philbrick, could you give us any information on the question of the attitude of the Communist Party toward religion? Do they consider it important as far as Communist domination is concerned?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, sir; they do, and I was originally given that Communist Party training and instruction as to the party attitude

¹ Released by the full committee.

toward religion in my earliest days in the Communist Party movement when I was first asked to join, and did join after consulting with the FBI, the Young Communist League.

Immediately after joining the YCL I discovered that one of the most important aspects of our work was that of educational sessions which took place at regular YCL meetings every other week. We had in our YCL in Cambridge, Mass., a number of young college people, mostly young college people, and young folks from the neighborhood there in Cambridge.

One of the textbooks which was used in the training of these embryo Communists was a book written by Lenin called *The Tasks of Youth*. This book was printed by the Communist Party in this country and had a foreword in the book by Alexander Trachtenberg, one of the top Politbureau members here in the United States.

Mr. Trachtenberg in his foreword explained that although this was a speech delivered by Lenin many years ago to the Young Communist League in the Soviet Union, it applied very specifically and directly to the young people, the youth, in capitalist countries, too, and our instructor at our YCL cell explained to us that this, of course, included that of the young people in the United States.

I would suggest the part which applies specifically to No. 1, the vast importance of reeducating the young people in order to create a Communist society; and No. 2, the principal objectives of the Communist Party in educating and reaching the young people, because Lenin states quite specifically that the prime objective of the Communist Party should be to imbue the youth with Communist ethics, and there is thereafter a passage which says that of course Communists do not believe in God and that they know that the clergy speak in the name of God only in order to serve the interests of the capitalist class of the nation, and as Communists, of course, we know therefore that everything they say is completely false.

In the first place, we were told, the Communist Party must imbue the youth with a completely new type of ethics, and that comprises Communist ethics, and then they go on further to say that this type of ethics means that you do whatever is necessary in order to accomplish your objectives.

Mr. CLARDY. May I interrupt you? The word "ethics" is badly misused there because it means an absence of ethics.

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is true.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you ever taught specifically in these meetings what the Communist Party intended in regard to religion in the United States of America?

Mr. CLARDY. You mean what its program of assaulting and destroying religion may have been?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes; if he wishes to go into that.

Mr. PHILBRICK. Well, I believe again that the text of this particular book will show quite clearly that communism and religion cannot exist side by side in any society; that either one or the other must be destroyed, and that was the Communist Party position.

Now, so far as the strategy, and tactics, of the Communist Party in this country are concerned, under present conditions we were taught that the Communist Party at this moment was not to destroy religion in the United States but to use it.

Now, for example, as the committee knows from my previous testimony, I was instructed to be an underground secret member of the Communist Party. At one point in my experiences I moved from the community of Cambridge, Mass., up to Wakefield, and I was called into a special meeting of the Young Communist League at that time, and one of my instructions that was given to me before moving up to this new community was that I was to join the local church in that community. The reason for joining it was severalfold.

Number one, and the most important reason, was that no Communist is of any value to the Communist Party if he isolates himself from the masses of the people. He must, instead, I was told, cement closer ties with the masses of the people. The comrades knew that I had always been very active in Christian youth work; he had been head of a young Baptist youth organization, and they said that those contacts now are very valuable. "You know many adult leaders in the Christian youth movement, and you must under no circumstances do anything to disrupt those connections. You must, instead, keep those relationships."

(Representative Gordon H. Scherer returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. KUNZIG. Are individual clergymen of value to the Communist Party when, as, and if they may be Communists themselves?

Mr. PHILBRICK. They indeed are, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you explain to the committee, perhaps in some detail, how that could happen in the first place and just what individual clergymen could do to assist the party?

Mr. MOULDER. Does he know specifically of such a situation?

Mr. KUNZIG. That is the next question.

Mr. MOULDER. He should testify on that rather than to reach conclusions of his own. We hear that story from so many people.

Mr. CLARDY. I think, Congressman, if we did get the background of that first and then go into detail—because I think of another angle of it right now that will follow logically after the philosophical angle.

Mr. KUNZIG. That was my intention, sir; then to go into specific knowledge of this witness.

Mr. CLARDY. After he answers this question. Before you do, I have one to interpose, but go ahead and answer this one.

Mr. PHILBRICK. All right. I will begin, and then at any time please ask me any further questions that may help.

Perhaps the best way to begin is to review again testimony previously given before this committee on July 23, 1951. At that time I related that after many years in the Communist Party movement, and having slowly gone up the ladder in the Communist Party, I was moved out of the regular Communist Party organization, was ordered to sever all of my connections with known Communists and to go even deeper underground and to become a member of the pro group section of the Communist Party in Boston, Mass.

Mr. CLARDY. Meaning the professional group?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes; and as I testified before, before this committee, this pro group was composed, I discovered, of doctors, lawyers, teachers, professors, businessmen, Government workers, and people in communications such as the newspaper and radio and telephone, and also

in Boston, Mass., a cell of special Communists who were posing as ministers of the gospel.

Mr. CLARDY. You say "posing." Explain that.

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is right; because these men certainly were not true ministers of the gospel in any way, shape, or manner. They were Communists first and completely—dedicated, hardened, steeled Communists—because otherwise you could never be a member of the pro group section.

Mr. CLARDY. That leads to the question that I had in mind. How were they recruited, or if not recruited, how did they get into that position of important responsibility?

Mr. PHILBRICK. So far as I could determine, these individuals were Communists before they became ministers. Just before I got out of the Communist Party in 1949 I was attending a series of secret sessions of a Communist school called the Boston School for Marxist Studies. The sessions I attended were at the home of Otis Archer Hood, the chairman of the Communist Party in Massachusetts.

One of the students in this special course was a young theological student who was already a member of the Communist Party, but was being assigned by the Communist Party to move into the religious field, and that meant that he would have to go through his preliminary training at college and then go into a theological seminary and then be ordained as a minister in one of the major denominations.

Mr. CLARDY. Then what you are saying is that it is part of the Communist plot to start someone on the road to the ministry, knowing full well that he is not going to be a minister in the true sense of the word, but merely as a party agent?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is absolutely true, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you recall this man's name you are referring to in your testimony?

Mr. PHILBRICK. No; I do not. In fact, so far as I can recall, I never did learn his name. This was just prior to my appearance on the witness stand before Judge Medina, and the course had not been completed, and, as you know, at any of these secret sessions, full names were never used, only first names or nicknames. Sometimes you would sit directly next to a person for weeks at a time without ever knowing who he was. It was a very difficult job, even inside of your own cell, to discover the identity of everyone, so it is not my recollection now whether I learned the identity of this individual or not.

I can't recall it now.

Mr. CLARDY. Then the thing you are saying is that there isn't so much recruitment of ministers, but rather the attempt to insinuate people into the ministry who are Communists to start with?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is the initial phase of it, sir, but then following that, and of great aid and assistance to the Communist Party, is their campaign of using non-Communist Party ministers and victimizing innocent individuals in the religious field.

Mr. CLARDY. How?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Well, that is done in a thousand different ways. It is done through the circulation of petitions. It is done by the soliciting of funds for Communist-front organizations. It is done by inviting ministers to join Communist-front organizations and to give their permission to use their names on the letterheads of these Communist-front organizations.

Mr. CLARDY. You mean without disclosing the fact that they are deliberately trying to dupe the ministers?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is right; that is right.

Now, I can give many, many examples of how that is done, but just let me illustrate one. In 1943 I was contacted by the Communist Party headquarters in Boston and was told that the Young Communist League was going to be dissolved and that a new youth organization would be formed by the Communist Party. I was instructed to come to New York City to attend the dissolution of the YCL and to further attend the formation of this new youth organization.

I was told that the new organization would be called American Youth for Democracy, AYD. I was further told that upon my return to Massachusetts the party wanted to have me and would assign me to be the State treasurer in Massachusetts of this organization. I came to New York, attended the conventions as instructed, and went back to Massachusetts.

In Massachusetts we sent out letters of invitation to every youth organization we could find, either in the telephone book or on the listings of church manuals, and so forth. These letters went out to these young people. They came to a founding convention of the AYD in Massachusetts and we had a very, quote, "democratic," end of quote election.

There were nominations from the floor for the officers; voting was by secret ballot and Herbert A. Philbrick was elected State treasurer of AYD. Not one of those young people knew that that decision had been made by the Communist Party long before they had even heard of the name of the organization.

Mr. CLARDY. How was the manipulation of the ballots handled?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Well, that would take a long time to explain how that was done, but the key to the situation was this, that in the letters that were sent out from Communist Party headquarters to these youth organizations, Herbert A. Philbrick was listed as a Baptist youth leader, and these young people did not know they were voting for a cardholding, dues-paying member of the Communist Party. They thought that they were voting for a Baptist youth leader.

Now, the Baptist Church had no knowledge that this was being done. I was not officially a delegate from the Baptist Church. That was simply the tag put onto my name by the Communist Party. That is just one example of how a church signature is used by the Communist Party in order to obtain certain ends.

To have a Communist Party member in such a key position was of vital and vast importance to the party—state treasurer.

Now, in the same organization we had, of course, a national headquarters; we had a national magazine; we had a great deal of propaganda which went out over the name of AYD. In these publications, in this propaganda appeal, a certain amount of it was written by a man called Reverend Eliot—I think his name is—White. A great many young people, non-Communist young people, joined AYD because they would assume, and had full right to assume, that any individual member of the clergy could be trusted, and that any organization being backed and being testified to by a member of the clergy should be a legitimate organization. The fact is that Reverend Eliot

White, according to his own statements made long after AYD folded, was and is a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. CLARDY. Was he actually a minister of the Gospel?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I believe he was ordained as such; yes, sir. I know that his picture which we featured in our Communist publication showed him wearing a clerical collar, and his name always appeared as Rev. Eliot White.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, having had some experience in other fields and knowing how their titles are assumed many times, I ask you that wondering if it was possible—

Mr. PHILBRICK. So far as I know, his church organization has taken no action against him, sir, and so far as I know, his church organization has not taken that title away from him nor prevented him from using that title in this Communist-front organization.

Mr. CLARDY. All right; proceed.

Mr. PHILBRICK. In 1947, when I joined the pro group, shortly thereafter, we selected a new chairman for our very secret, deeply underground cell. The chairman of our underground cell, the new chairman, was a Martha Fletcher. Martha Fletcher also was the head of the Unitarian youth movement in this country, and she worked directly for Rev. Stephen Fritchman at Unitarian headquarters in Boston, Mass. I knew that she had obtained that position because it was known that she was a disciplined member of the Communist Party.

Certainly for the Communist Party to be able to move somebody into such a position of such vital importance to the Christian Church in this country, I think, is highly significant and very dangerous. Martha Fletcher is now in Paris, and I understand that her attorneys have advised her to stay there.

Another example I can give is the time when Rev. Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury, came to this country.

Mr. CLARDY. Commonly called the Red Dean.

Mr. PHILBRICK. Before he arrived in this country I received instructions from Communist Party headquarters that I was to work together with another comrade as a committee of two to prepare for the arrival of the Red Dean and to form a proper welcome to the Red Dean when he arrived in this country, and specifically in Boston.

The comrade I was assigned to work with at that time was Mrs. Elizabeth Moos, mother-in-law of the convicted perjurer, William Remington. She and I worked together at her apartment on Walnut Street in Boston.

Certainly neither she nor I could have achieved very much for the party by ourselves. That work had to be done by the subversive group of individuals, of Communists, posing as ministers because they in turn, of course, have had entree to other non-Communist clergy, and I think that the record will show that the dean was given a very fine welcome to Boston, and that was achieved through the efforts and the work of this small subversive cell of ministers in Boston.

Mr. KUNZIG. To the best of your knowledge when was the date of his arrival to this country, on this particular occasion?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I don't recall the exact date at the present time. However, I did write an article in great detail explaining this operation for the New York Herald Tribune about a year ago, and if the committee would desire, I would be glad to send that complete article in to you because in it the operation is described.

Mr. CLARDY. Send it along, and Mr. Counsel, have it marked as "Exhibit 1" upon its receipt.

(The article from the New York Herald Tribune, marked, and received in evidence as "Philbrick Exhibit No. 1" is retained in committee files.)

Mr. CLARDY. That was several years ago. I remember the incident, but I can't recall the date, either. As I remember, there were some patriotic demonstrations against his reception, too.

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are there any other specific illustrations such as the type you are now giving?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I would say that in almost every Communist-front operation we used the names of one or more ministers; and again the idea of the Communist Party, because all of these fronts were formed under the guidance of the Communist Party itself, was that the names of these ministers would enable the party to victimize a great many more people than they otherwise would be able to. I think it has been accurately estimated before this committee, as a matter of fact, that the Communist Party in this country has been able to obtain from non-Communist sources sums up to \$50 million a year obtained from non-Communist individuals and even some anti-Communist, and yet used for Communist Party purposes.

There again the names of ministers are extremely valuable to the Communist Party in enabling them to carry out that type of a fraudulent operation.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are the ministers to which you are referring, now listed in these different front organizations, largely non-Communists themselves, or were they?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is right, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Who were duped?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is true.

Mr. CLARDY. They were shown a good objective and enlisted in a cause they thought worthy?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is completely right, sir. Since I have gotten out of the party, since 1949, it is evident to me, following Communist Party documents and manuals and the Daily Worker and other publications regularly, that the party today is even more successful in using ministers and in victimizing ministers than they were while I was in the party. For example, the Daily Worker reported that 2,300 ministers signed petitions for clemency for the Rosenbergs.

Mr. CLARDY. That isn't the best authority in the world, but at any rate, we can accept the fact that there must have been a considerable number.

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you have any other specific example of a recent situation of this type other than this Rosenberg situation, a specific example of where a minister was used or his name was used?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Again there are so many examples which—

Mr. SCHERER. May I interrupt off the record?

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you continue?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, sir. One of the most flagrant examples occurred just about the first of this year, and this was a petition which was published widely in the Communist press, not only in this coun-

try, but all over the world. This Communist propaganda set forth that ministers in this country had stated that the Government of the United States was jailing political prisoners and political dissenters and was causing suffering to people for their political views and that increasing multitudes of the people in the United States consider that the United States fears the American people; the United States Government fears the American people and is no longer strong enough to tolerate freedom of speech and political association.

Now, this was a Communist plan, propaganda plan, specifically designed to create hatred and enmity against the United States.

The propaganda was true in that indeed a large number of ministers had signed this petition.

Well, what was the story? The story was that the Communist Party in this country had circulated a petition to the President of the United States, asking the President to grant amnesty to the convicted leaders of the Communist Party, the 11.

Again—what you said wasn't on the record.

Mr. SCHIERER. No; it wasn't on the record, but eventually I am going to talk to this minister to try to get it on the record.

Mr. PHILBRICK. Well, again, as you had explained, the approach was made to these ministers for a very fine reason, you see. The letter was sent out over the name of a man who signed himself as a reverend. The ministers who received the letter were asked to sign a return postcard, and the return postcard went to a post office box in Philadelphia, Pa.

Mr. SCHIERER. This is in connection with the 11 convicted Communists?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, and again the approach was that in the time of Christmas and the time of good will to men, this would be a fine time to permit these prisoners to spend the Christmas season with their families at home.

Mr. SCHIERER. You know that that is what they did?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is right, because I telephoned, and it so happened that 280 names were obtained by mail and by personal solicitation for this petition. More than 25 percent of the names were ministers. I knew some of the people on that list, and I called one of them. I called the dean of Andover—Newton Theological Seminary, Dr. Herbert Gezork, G-e-z-o-r-k, because I knew that Dr. Gezork was certainly not only not a Communist, but he is very much of an anti-Communist. His own parents have perished under the Communists in Europe, and Dr. Gezork was shocked when he discovered that the petition was appearing in the Communist press with the use of his name, and he was the one who explained it to me, after some difficulty in recollecting it at all, as to how the comrades had managed to get his name.

The original approach had been made to him sometimes before Christmas, and he acknowledges he very foolishly signed this card and returned it. However, he did what many other ministers should do. He immediately dispatched telegrams to the person who had solicited his name and to the press and to the President, asking that his name be stricken from that list immediately because he certainly was not in favor of any of the objectives as set forth in the text.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Philbrick, you mentioned before that you had heard of specific ministers. I wanted to ask you whether you could give this committee specific names of ministers whom you personally

knew; let us say first, whom you personally knew as members of the Communist Party, and then perhaps secondly, ministers whom you heard of as members of the Communist Party.

Mr. PHILBRICK. First of all, I have no legal evidence which would stand in the United States court of law to prove that any of these individuals, members of the clergy, are in fact also members of the Communist Party. That, of course, is because of the way in which the Communist Party is organized. Each cell in the pro group underground section of the Communist Party is isolated. You are given strict instructions that you are to have nothing to do with any comrade outside of your own cell. You are never to mention the name of another Communist in your own cell, even though you may have knowledge of his membership.

If I had stayed in the Communist Party for another few months, I think I would be able to furnish the committee with firsthand knowledge as to the identity of these ministers in the Boston area.

I did learn from my pro group sources that there were perhaps 7 to 8 of these ministers in the Boston area. There were 70 to 80 members in the pro group as a whole in Boston.

Now, I was also, however, told from time to time inadvertently by other comrades that certain people were members of the Communist Party. One of these instances involved that of Rev. Stephen Fritchman who has, I believe, appeared before this committee. Martha Fletcher, the chairman of our pro group cell, worked directly for Stephen Fritchman, and she left no doubt at all in my mind that Stephen Fritchman was indeed a member of the Communist Party.

Rev. Eliot White, the name of Rev. Eliot White, I have already given to you.

There again I guess that is hearsay evidence since that knowledge I gained from reading the press, Communist press.

Mr. KUNZIG. Any others?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Let me see. Off the record. I am trying to recall the fellow's name.

Mr. CLARDY. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. PHILBRICK. Rev. Anthony de Lucca, d-e L-u-c-c-a, formerly a minister in Wakefield, Mass., who, I was told by members of the party, had been the chairman of the Communist Party cell in Wakefield for a time.

Mr. KUNZIG. You mentioned 6 or 7 that you knew existed in the Boston area. How did you know that there were 6 or 7 if you don't know their names?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I believe that came up in the course of one of our fund-raising drives, and in our cell meeting we were discussing the sources of—we had to raise \$3,500 from our pro group section of 70 to 80 people, which was quite a large sum for that small number, and that posed the problem as to just how we were to go about it, and it was said at that time that we can't expect very much from our 7 to 8 ministers.

Mr. KUNZIG. You don't know the names of these 7 or 8?

Mr. PHILBRICK. No; in my own mind I am pretty certain I know who they are, sir, but I have never had any direct legal knowledge as to their identity. The reason again would be, as I explained before,

because these people were operating in a completely deeply underground way. They used the utmost security efforts to prevent, specifically to prevent, any Government agent or any counterspy from obtaining legal evidence which could be at a later date used against them.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you suggesting that you, yourself, although you have no specific legal evidence as to who they are, actually from your own experience, have a pretty good idea who the individuals are?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. You mentioned a while ago that you were told by someone of the person who was a minister and a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. As you state, that was purely hearsay, but can you say who told you that?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Martha Fletcher told me that Stephen Fritchman was a member, and Elizabeth Guarnaccia, G-u-a-r-n-a-c-c-i-a, told me that de Lucca was chairman of the party in Wakefield.

This was prior to the time when I became active in the Wakefield cell.

Mr. MOULDER. Where does she now reside?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Now in Medford, Mass.; she appeared recently before the Senate committee, used the fifth amendment and has lost her position as a schoolteacher in the Somerville High School, Massachusetts.

Mr. CLARDY. You knew her to be a Communist?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Very well, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Philbrick, seeing as we are here in executive session, and this testimony being confidential, do you feel you could tell the committee the names of these ministers in the Boston area whom you, as you said, have a pretty good idea were the ones that you feel were the members of the Communist Party?

Mr. PHILBRICK. How does the chairman feel about that?

Mr. CLARDY. If you can name them; yes.

Mr. MOULDER. On what do you base your opinion?

Mr. SCHERER. He just told us of his connection—

Mr. PHILBRICK. I would base my opinion upon such things as this, for example: I would meet with Elizabeth Moos; we had certain orders and instructions that we were to do these certain things. Elizabeth Moos, I knew, was to contact these further individuals and told to have them do specific things. A week or so later these people would have done precisely what we were ordered to have told them to do.

My only conclusion would be that they were following Communist Party orders and instructions. This happened with some of these individuals over the course of a long period of time.

Mr. KUNZIG. Again and again and again?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Through every twist and turn of the Communist Party line.

Mr. KUNZIG. You would be in a meeting or someone would tell you that specific instructions of a certain nature were to go to these particular ministers, without naming the ministers?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is right, the names would not be used for security reasons.

Mr. KUNZIG. Then you would later see that certain particular ministers whom you did not know to be Communists in the sense that you met with them in the party did exactly the things that the instructions contained?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is right, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. For an example, what were some of the instructions?

Mr. PHILBRICK. One of the programs we had was to set up a Communist Party school in Boston, patterned after the Jefferson School of Social Science in New York City. This would be presented publicly as a non-Communist school, and the objective of the party was to enroll non-Communists in these Marxist courses. Therefore, again it was necessary to present this as a legitimate educational effort. I believe the record will show that certain ministers became sponsors of the Samuel Adams School in Boston, and their names appear on the letterhead of this organization, which I believe has been cited as subversive by either this committee or by the Attorney General.

Mr. MOULDER. Yes, that is right.

Mr. CLARDY. You, of course, were busy as an agent of the FBI, opening your eyes and your ears to everything that came along, and is it your considered judgment, based on all of that, that these people we are talking about were—

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, sir. Then we had many other campaigns: The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, a fund-raising campaign; the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, headed nationally by Corliss Lamont; AYD; Youth for Victory. I could run through just project after project, and I am sure that the public record will show that certain members of the clergy went right down the line, as I say, through every twist and turn of the Communist Party.

Mr. CLARDY. You think then that in some instances it is a little too pat to really be a coincidence?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, sir. Also we had the use of the facilities of some of the churches and their facilities for Communist Party purposes.

This happened over such a long period of time that it was simply incredible and impossible that the minister in charge did not know or could not have known what was going on.

One of the most active centers of Communist Party activity then and now in Boston is the Community Church of Boston. The Community Church is headed by Rev. Donald Lothrop, L-o-t-h-r-o-p. He is one of the individuals who, I am sure in my own mind, is operating under Communist Party discipline. I have no doubt about it at all, and I would not make the statement if I had the faintest doubt as to where that man's loyalty lies.

Mr. KUNZIG. Then could you give us for the record in executive session here this afternoon these names to which you have referred?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, I could. Donald Lothrop is one. The Reverend Joseph Fletcher, F-l-e-t-c-h-e-r, of the theological seminary, Episcopal Theological Seminary in Cambridge, Mass., is another. Joe Fletcher worked with us on Communist Party projects and on enormous number of tasks.

Mr. CLARDY. He is still there?

Mr. PHILBRICK. He is, sir.

Another minister—and I almost feel like saying—quote—“minister” in each of these cases because they are something entirely different from what I comprehend to be a true minister of the Gospel—

Mr. CLARDY. You would say they were a disgrace to the ministry?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I certainly would, sir. Rev. Kenneth DePew Hughes of St. Bartholomew's Church in Cambridge, Mass., is another one of those who worked with the Communist Party over the period of years, and so far as I know, is still working with the party today.

I can't recall the names of the others now.

Mr. CLARDY. You can supply that to us, if you will, in the form of a memorandum.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know Margaret Gilbert?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes; I do, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. What were your relations, political relations, with her?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Margaret Gilbert, who is known to us in our pro-group cell as Comrade Peg—

Mr. CLARDY. Comrade who?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Comrade Peg. Comrade Peg was a member of our pro group cell in Cambridge, Mass.

We held Communist Party meetings at her home.

Mr. KUNZIG. You knew her, of course, to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, sir.

(Representative Gordon H. Scherer left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. KUNZIG. To the best of your knowledge, Mr. Philbrick, and if you could possibly search your judgment to see if this were possible, would you have any way of knowing whether Margaret Gilbert would also know the names of these clergymen to which you have been referring?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Well, let me say first that the Communist Party itself did everything it could to prevent any comrades from having any knowledge outside of their immediate circle of cell members. Up until 1948 this consisted of 12 to 15 people; after 1948 the number was reduced to only 5. However, it is quite possible that Peg Gilbert could have discovered the identity of some of these people in the same way that I did through some inadvertent slip by one or more comrades who revealed information which, according to strict party rules, they should not have revealed. Peg Gilbert was very active in the party movement. She was at the headquarters of the Samuel Adams School there in Boston, and it is quite possible that she would have knowledge as to those clergy who cooperated with that particular Communist Party function.

Mr. KUNZIG. I wanted to ask you one further question. You mentioned a man connected with the theological seminary. Could you give the committee briefly, if it should be within your knowledge, any information that you have with regard to the Communist Party's attitude toward getting an inroad in divinity schools or theological seminaries, outside of the situation of just handling individual ministers?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That was most important, sir, and a prime objective of the Communist Party.

Mr. KUNZIG. For the obvious purpose, I assume, of being able to train a large and newer crop?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is true.

Mr. KUNZIG. Of mildly liberals, further leftists, and finally, perhaps, Communists?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is true.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have here a document marked "Philbrick Exhibit No. 2" for identification, which is your pamphlet, *The Communists Are After Your Church*, with a foreword by Dr. Daniel A. Poling. I should like, with your permission, sir, to offer this in evidence as Philbrick Exhibit No. 1.

Mr. CLARDY. It will be received.

(The pamphlet, *The Communists Are After Your Church*, was received in evidence as Philbrick Exhibit No. 1.)

PHILBRICK EXHIBIT No. 1.

[A reprint of Mr. Philbrick's article in *Christian Herald*]

THE COMMUNISTS ARE AFTER YOUR CHURCH

By Herbert A. Philbrick, author of *I Led Three Lives*

Subversion in the sanctuary is no scare cry—it's happening. Ruthless Communists—in clerical garb and out—are "using" unsuspecting church members in a vicious assault on democracy and religion. A man who was one of them tells here the shocking story.

(Herbert A. Philbrick in 1940 became chairman of a Boston suburban youth group only to discover that a group of Communists had "captured" his organization. About to resign, he decided instead to take his problem to the FBI. They suggested that he might stay in, learn Communist intentions. For 9 years he did, eventually being taken into the inner circle—the all-powerful pro-4 group, masters of Communist strategy for the area. Eventually the FBI had sufficient evidence to spring the trap on the 11 Communist leaders who were brought to trial in New York, April 1949. Until the moment he appeared as a surprise witness against the defendants, Herbert Philbrick had been a top-drawer Communist in good standing. The story of his perilous existence as citizen-Communist-counterspy is told in his book, *I Led Three Lives*. Here he tells a story never before revealed of Communist infiltration into America's churches.)

THE COMMUNISTS ARE AFTER YOUR CHURCH

Loyal church members, indignant at the announced intention of congressional investigators to root out subversion in the sanctuary, had better be looking to their own housecleaning. Here's the clear danger, and how to see to it that you are not duped or used by Communists.

Whether your church is a city cathedral or a village meetinghouse, the Communists are out to get it. Not that they intend to put your church out of business—just yet. They don't. They want to use it. They want to use you, a good church member, as they have used many others to "front" for their own objective, which is nothing less than the ultimate and complete destruction of democracy and religious faith.

I know what the Communists are out to do.

For 9 years I was a volunteer counterspy for the FBI, observing and participating in Communist strategy from the grassroots to high levels. And through loyal Americans who occupy key positions within the anti-Red underground, I know that the Communist threat to your church is greater now than at any time in 20 years. I know how the Reds have planted secret Communists in pulpits, how they have infiltrated seminaries, how they "use" good and unsuspecting Protestants, Catholics, and Jews they have duped.

This is the story of what I know—as much of it as may be revealed—told so that you will realize that subversion in the sanctuary is the most deadly and insidious menace facing America today, and so that you will be not only aware of the danger but prepared to counteract it.

To disabuse the inevitable charge of "Redbaiting" let it be said at the outset that I was—and still am—a liberal. I believed then and I believe now that the social wrongs in the world and specifically in America ought to be righted. This is in my Baptist blood. I have a deep respect for liberals, being one of them. And I believe it is no unsurmountable task to sort out honest liberals from dishonest Communists. It can be done. It must be done if the churches are to win their life-and-death struggle with Marxism. Religion is making a poor showing in that struggle as of now.

It is no accident that your church is the No. 1 target of the Communist conspiracy in America today. The Reds have been flushed from previous cover. For one thing, since the war the Communists have suffered severe setbacks in the field of labor. They have lost control of many unions which they once dominated. Having lost power there, they have sought to gain power in another area—and the churches were selected as the target.

As an example of the shift from labor to the church, consider one of the most notorious and flagrant Communist fronts, the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, cited as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States as far back as June 1, 1948. Yet the November 24, 1952, issue of the Daily Worker carried the names of "20 notables" cooperating and working with the Red organization—and at least 6 of the 20 are clergymen. The success which Communists have had in following party orders to infiltrate and use church leaders is indicated by the fact that there were more preachers on the list of names than representatives of any other profession; and there was not a single name of a responsible labor leader in the group.

Secondly, Government prosecution and congressional investigations have sent thousands of comrades scurrying for respectable disguises. As a disguise, the church offers Communists decided advantages. It is the stronghold of idealism. It is the place where one expects to find a social conscience. It is above reproach—the perfect cover for Communist agents, the perfect place for the recruiting of unsuspecting puppets. Never is an angel of darkness more secure than when he poses as an angel of light.

Obvious evidence that the angels of darkness are deceiving the very elect is the increasing number of Communist-sponsored petitions going out over the imprimatur of ministers of the Gospel, and the outside number of clergy who are signatories. It's no happenstance, but the result of a desperate, carefully planned Communist strategy. The Reds didn't need the churches in past years; they had ample other channels of subversion. They do need the churches now. The will fight savagely for your church.

And they will fight no holds barred. For (1) no matter how well camouflaged it may be, the ultimate Soviet goal is the absolute, complete destruction of not only religious organizations but the whole moral structure of the Hebrew and Christian religions—and, remember this always, the unchanging Communist tactic is to destroy from within, hardly ever by frontal assault from the outside; (2) the Soviet pattern of aggression is always copied by all Communist parties of the world, with adaptations to fit the existing conditions in any particular country; and (3) the Communist rule of aggression is based squarely on the ruthless conviction that the ends justify the means.

Even though happenings in Europe and Asia in fact foretell what is in store for America, how far has communism actually gone in penetrating religious organizations here?

Communism in American churches has gone shockingly far. I was a part of the plot. As far as the comrades knew, I was a fellow plotter. And nowhere have I seen such cynical glee as I saw again and again on the faces of the comrades when some well-meaning but woefully misguided church leader was hooked on the Communist line.

The Communists have gone far in their seduction of church young people. Of all Christians, youth are the crusaders, quick to challenge the established order, quick to mount any bandwagon that seems headed toward a brighter tomorrow.

I was 25 that spring of 1940 when I walked into the office of the Massachusetts Youth Council of Boston. I was a youthful salesman confident of my ability to make a living, a youthful Christian bent on making the world safe for peace and brotherhood. When I walked out of that office, I had been won over. I was given the flattering assignment of organizing the Cambridge Youth Council.

By the end of December, I knew that I had been "taken." That was when I went to the FBI and they suggested that I might stay where I was to discover the Communists' intentions. The 9-year experience led me as near to the top of the Communist organization as it is possible to go, and culminated in my being a witness in New York in the Government's case against 11 Communist leaders.

In 1942 I was ordered by the party to maintain strong ties with the Baptist Church, the denomination with which I had been affiliated since early youth. I did this, joining the First Baptist Church of Wakefield, Mass., becoming a member of the administration committee, chairman of the public-relations committee, Sunday-school teacher, and head of the young married couples' club. None of the church members had any knowledge of my affiliation with the Communist Party. The party bosses instructed me to carry out Communist projects in the church. I "neglected" to do so, using as my excuse the pressure of other party responsibilities. A genuine Communist in my position could have wreaked havoc on religion.

The Communists have made advances not only in their capture of youth, but in their use of clergymen. Clever indeed are the appeals made for ministerial support on humanitarian grounds, resulting in the support the party wants. The publicly available record of support elicited by the comrades among church leaders is appalling. Virtually no Communist or Communist-front activity takes place today without ministerial and church support, sponsorship, or participation.

Sometimes this shows up in church literature. The Communist Party leans heavily upon publicly printed and distributed magazines, papers, and books which do not bear Communist Party identification as such. But one can spot the Communist influence by the terminology often used—the scoffing at capitalism, the labeling of the United States as "imperialist," the sneering directed at the profit motive. America is not wholly perfect. But neither is it wholly imperfect, as the Communists would have you believe.

Most of the persons involved—in the pulpit, in publishing, in the training of ministers—have been duped. It is not so difficult to believe that good men can be hoodwinked. But it will come as a jolt to many Christians to discover that some members of the clergy are not dupes but hardened Communists who are completely loyal to Russia.

When in the fall of 1947 I was ordered by the party to cut off all previous Communist Party associations, to destroy my Communist Party membership card and never to carry one again, to go "underground" and to join that top-level section of the party identified as the "pro-group," I was shocked to discover in the pro-group (variously known as pro-4, pro-C and other coded designations) certain leading citizens of the New England States whom I had known publicly, outside of the Communist Party, without any prior knowledge that they were members of the Communist Party itself. Among them were doctors, lawyers, teachers, professors, businessmen, authors, publishers, Government workers. And there they were, well trained, highly educated, enjoying the confidence and trust of large numbers of people about them—the most deeply underground section of the Communist Party in this Nation. I discovered that in Boston the party had 70 to 80 pro-group members.

But, to me, the most shocking fact was that there was also a special subversive cell of hardened, disciplined, trained agents of Stalin, men who were ministers of the Gospel.

Members of major denominations, they were assigned countless special tasks for the Communist conspiracy. Among the tasks were these: Helping to spread Soviet-inspired dissension and confusion; subtly injecting distrust in our Government, our leaders, and our way of life; spreading distrust and hatred of "capitalists," businessmen, employers, company heads, stockowners; popularizing a sly contempt for the police, the courts, the FBI, and other Government law-enforcement agencies; attacking all anti-Communist individuals, laws, measures and investigative groups; defending Communist Party members and fellow travelers; lending their weight to the indoctrinating of youth in seminars; participating in Soviet espionage and transmitting intelligence information for the Soviet Government; providing stature and integrity to Communists and pro-Communists by church sponsorship; and, by clever and subtle operation, victimizing many hundreds of non-Communist ministers and laymen into seeming support of the Soviet dictatorship and enmity against their own United States Government.

I am not guessing about this. I saw those ministers in action—ruthless Communist leaders, prostituting the Christian ministry to the evil ends of atheism

and oppression. They knew exactly what they were doing. They were clergymen because it suited their purpose and that of their superiors to be clergymen.

I remember the occasion in 1948 when urgent instructions were sent to me from Communist Party headquarters to immediately contact Elizabeth Moos, former mother-in-law of the now convicted perjurer, William Remington. She and I, both trusted members of the Communist Party underground, were to work on a special project. The job was to organize a suitable welcome for the dean of Canterbury, the Right Reverend Hewlett Johnson. Also assigned to the project was the Boston cell of ministers, whose loyalty to the Soviet Union was unquestioned by the Communist Party leaders.

When the dean finally arrived in Boston, I was "privileged" to meet him under special circumstances—in a closed, secret meeting of highly placed comrades under conditions that could mean only one thing; that Hewlett Johnson, was himself not only a secret, trusted member of the Communist International, but a person of extreme importance and value to the Soviet conspiracy.

I remember another incident when I sat in a pro-group meeting in the Grove Street apartment of Mrs. Harold A. Fletcher, Jr., or Martha Fletcher, as she was known to hundreds of Boston young people for her youth work in the Unitarian Church. It was my job that evening to lead the discussion on the use of civil disobedience as a Communist weapon; Martha—trusted youth leader of her denomination—broke in: "The time has come when we must be realistic. We Communists must be vigilant to support incidents of civil disobedience wherever we find them, and to initiate them where necessary."

So much for the out-and-out Communist who knows exactly what he is doing and why. What of the good person who is eagerly trying to improve social and economic conditions? How is he used?

Consider the public reception for the dean of Canterbury. There were many non-Communists present for the "welcome"—all of them duped by persons they trusted. The names of clergymen on the initial announcement gave an aura of Christian respectability to the occasion, and unsuspecting folks went along. Why should anyone distrust a minister? This was unthinkable—to anybody but a Communist, who uses any means to accomplish his ends.

My own church membership helped to establish my all-important "cover" so that I could be used safely by the party in other projects. Thus, when American Youth for Democracy was formed, Comrade Philbrick, the Massachusetts State treasurer, was billed as a "Baptist youth leader." The same was true with the Cambridge Committee for Equal Opportunities, Youth for Victory, and innumerable other Communist fronts.

Ministers, too, were used to allay any possible suspicion by the public of subversive activity. In the Massachusetts AYD not only was a "Baptist youth leader"—myself—the treasurer, but the list of adult sponsors included the names of three ministers on the letterhead: Rev. Stephen H. Fritchman, Rev. Kenneth DeP. Hughes, and Rev. F. Taylor Weil. Many hundreds of decent, honest, thoroughly loyal youths were tricked into joining AYD, a subversive organization if there ever was one, because they made the mistake of placing their trust in certain individuals with the title of "Rev."

A glance at the Daily Worker, Sunday Worker, Daily People's World, and other Communist documents is enlightening.

In a single issue of the Worker of Wednesday, January 7, there is—

—a report that at a "rally to save the Rosenbergs" on the lower East Side of New York, 2,000 messages asking clemency were distributed * * * signed by clergymen:

—an advertisement announcing a dinner honoring the publishers and stockholders of the Worker, on January 9. The caption of the advertisement is, "You're dining with Rev. Eliot White," and a photograph of the Reverend Mr. Eliot White complete with clerical collar appears in the ad;

—a triumphant editorial crowing about Communist success in exploiting the Rosenberg case. Brags the Worker, "Conservative men, Catholic priests * * * Protestant ministers * * * have spoken out for clemency."

The Communist propaganda campaign surrounding the Rosenberg case was undoubtedly the greatest single effort of its kind since the "release Earl Browder" drive. The direction of the Rosenberg campaign came from the Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case, at 1050 Avenue of the Americas, New York 18, N. Y. On the list of "sponsors" of the organization appear the names of two ministers and a rabbi. News releases on the committee's letterheads have been mailed over the name of a Methodist minister. Church folks who hold no brief for communism, but who are understandably and rightfully committed to the

precepts of brotherhood and social decency, see the names of clergymen on petitions or letterheads and are disarmed.

Petitions are one of the commonest—and most effective—Communist tools for enlisting the prestige value of the names of unsuspecting victims. The originating "Reverend" attracts other ministers, whose endorsements attract others—and the propaganda snowballs enormously. Many of the signers, if they discover their blunder later on, are too embarrassed to admit that they "didn't read" what they signed, or that the published statement attributed to their endorsement differed in substantial detail from what they had signed.

A few courageous ministers and laymen have admitted their error and sought publicly to correct them. The pastor of a suburban Presbyterian church in Cincinnati was one. Supposing that he was signing a statement asking that the 11 convicted Communist Party leaders be granted the privilege of visiting their families only over the Christmas holiday, he was dismayed to learn that he had actually endorsed complete amnesty—and published a retraction.

It is easy to see how he was misled in the first place. That petition to the President was prefaced with these glowing words: "As the Christmas season approaches, its message of God's grace to all men of good will rings out. Hope is born afresh for each individual man and woman in whose heart some genuine concern for others is nourished. The dignity of the individual, the sanctity of the family relationship, and the worth of human striving for the whole of mankind—these are the fruits of the Christian faith. In the words that Tolstoi made the title of a famous story, Where Love Is, God Is.

A great number of ministers fell into that carefully planned trap—mailed from the post-office box of a "Reverend" in New York. And on January 15 the Daily Worker announced gleefully that "One hundred and sixty-one church leaders representing 15 major Protestant denominations laid before President Truman at Christmas time their appeal for amnesty for 11 leaders of the Communist Party convicted under the Smith Act."

Another recent piece of Communist propaganda was also an "amnesty appeal" for the convicted 11. Contained among the usual platitudes and high-sounding noble phrases was this gem: "Increasing multitudes of people—including non-Communists and anti-Communists—consider that the continued imprisonment of these political dissenters means that the Government of the United States fears the American people, and is no longer strong enough to tolerate freedom of speech and political association." The propaganda line that the United States is a "police state," weak and shaky, living in fear of you and me, the American people, is unadulterated and typically brazen material straight from Moscow itself.

Yet, who signed this petition? Two hundred and eighty "prominent" Americans—and more than 25 percent of them ministers of the gospel.

I took the trouble to telephone some of these people, a few of whom I knew to be non-Communist. They were vague in their recollections. When I read the statement they had allegedly "signed," they were horrified.

How did intelligent church leaders fall into such a trap? In my file of material obtained from informants close to the comrades, I had a copy of the original letter which had gone out to these 280 persons. Their memory was vague because the "appeal" had been mailed to them August 11, 1952 (more than 4 months prior to its appearance in the Communist press).

And the persons who had fallen into the Communist trap then said to me: "I remember now—but the letter to me came from a minister—and so of course I did not suppose for a moment * * *."

It is also evident that most of them did not read the fine print on the attached statement; nor did they sign the statement itself, but merely a return post card preaddressed to a post-office box in Philadelphia. The victims were also not aware that the "minister," although ordained some years ago, has no church, parish, or standing in the Philadelphia area from which he operates, or that he has been flagrantly associated with a number of pro-Communist movements.

"Mass meetings" are always important to Communist Party agitators, and the use of religious leaders here is very helpful to the Reds. A Sunday, January 16, 1953, meeting held in New York City is typical of hundreds of similar ones conducted every month across the country. A group calling itself the National Committee To Defend Negro Leadership presented citations to "Negro men and women who have fought for democracy and peace"—noble objectives in anybody's book. Just in case the high purpose should fail to entice prospective victims, a galaxy of stars in clerical garb were prominently displayed. A minister delivered the invocation and was chairman of the citation committee.

All this, however, was only "cover" for the principle objective of the meeting: to build and promote the prestige and standing of top Communist Party bosses. The chief address was delivered by an editor of the official Communist Party publication, *Masses and Mainstream*. Paul Robeson also spoke, and was given a citation; poems by Langston Hughes were read. One citation was presented in absentia, to Henry Winston, who was convicted in the first trial of Communist Party "poliburo" members, but who fled after sentencing and is now a fugitive from justice. Apparently the clergymen saw nothing odd in sharing honors with a convicted criminal at large. The mass meeting is always good as a publicity buildup—and may snare you if you are not alert.

How can you guard against being "used" by forces diametrically opposed to what your church stands for?

First—and most important—don't go mistrusting every minister, rabbi, and priest in the land. The vast majority of clergymen are, of course, completely loyal to both God and country. So, don't go looking for Communists under every pulpit.

And we must not mistake religious individualism for indications of subversive activity. The traditional spirit of religious freedom so precious in America is of greater value and importance than ever before in the face of the rigid, totalitarian Soviet dictatorship. The tradition of dissent must always be strong, particularly among Protestant churches called into existence by their fearless protestations. The freedoms we enjoy today—what are they but the fruits of our lively and liberal Protestant heritage? The fearless championing of such freedoms must not be abandoned.

Admittedly the task of the Christian is difficult. He has a two-way fight on his hands: He must fight against reaction, and he must fight against being duped by Communist groups which are not liberal but the greatest and most vicious forces of reaction in the world. In view of what people know now of antigod communism, it would seem to be incredible that anyone can be seduced into its ranks. The greatest Communist deceit of all is that it makes good folks forget its barbarism by talking of its high objectives.

Religiously motivated social improvements in our great land must never be quenched. The long fights for social justice, racial tolerance and understanding, political and community corruption—all these and a thousand others we Protestants have waged must never slacken. But let's be sure whose leaders we're following and whose armor we're wearing. The New Testament writer John put it, "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world."

How are you, sincere in your faith, zealous in your Americanism, liberal in the truest sense of the word, to "try the spirits." Preeminently, know what you believe about God and about your country. And know what the Communists believe and advocate. Write for and examine the reports of the Senate and House investigations of Communist activity in the United Nations, education, the Soviet "peace" campaign against America, and others. Read qualified writers on the subject of communism. There are more than 300 available books on the subject, many of them at your local library.

A tipoff to watch for is the gigantic switch of policy—for Germany when the Hitler-Stalin pact was signed, against Germany when Hitler marched into Russia; sudden shifts resulting from Russia's new campaign of terror against the Jews. The true liberal doesn't easily change his mind. He doesn't blow hot one day and cold the next. He's for his convictions, come what may. But the dishonest "liberal," the Communist or would-be Communist, changes his dance to fit the tune piped by the Kremlin.

Don't be eager to sign the readymade and prepared petition or statement of any kind, no matter how desirable its goal may seem to be. If you wish to participate in a matter of national issue, it is far better to make your own statement, in your own words, and that you say what you think rather than what a secret Communist wants you to think.

Don't participate, without careful prior investigation, in "mass action" that merely looks good because it parrots some of your favorite idealistic phrases. Don't sign a petition simply because the name of a prominent preacher already appears on the list. Insist upon knowing the origin.

Don't open your church doors willy-nilly to every civic or "social betterment" group that comes along; first check and doublecheck their authenticity. The Communist, from long experience, has found a church to be an ideal meeting place. He gets a bigger audience, a respectable platform, and the cost is little and often nothing.

Never forget that a Communist is a Communist every day all day, in everything he does. However evil and sinister his methods, the Communist has outthought, outmaneuvered, and surpassed in dedication those of us who call ourselves by the name of Christ.

If we Christians cannot in this hour match and more than match the dedication of the Communists, then we will lose the fight—and we will deserve to lose.

But we will not lose—because we dare not.

[An editorial]

WHY THE PHILBRICK ARTICLE?

BY DANIEL A. POLING

Why our article in this issue, "The Communists Are After Your Church" by Herbert Philbrick?

The answer to that question is another question, the question of one of the most distinguished Christian liberals and evangelical scholars in America, Dr. Herbert Gezork, president of Andover-Newton Theological Seminary. Dr. Gezork was 1 of 280 signers of the petition to grant amnesty to the 11 Communist leaders who were convicted in Judge Harold Medina's court. The petition was presented to him months before it was released. Twenty-five percent of the two hundred eighty were clergymen—overwhelmingly Protestant clergymen. But when President Gezork saw the petition as finally presented to President Truman and released to the public, and read the signatures attached, he sent the following telegram to the President of the United States and also to Rev. Kenneth R. Forbes in Philadelphia, who had written him the original form letter:

"Please strike my name from the petition for amnesty to convicted Communist leaders, as I gave my signature unaware of the implications of the petition. I have consistently opposed Communist views and do not wish to be associated in any with this petition."

It is timely to note that Dr. Gezork served three times since World War II on Government missions to Germany. Both of his parents and several other relatives perished under the Communists of Eastern Germany.

This is Dr. Gezork's question, written to me in a personal letter: "Is there something that could be done to inform ministers and others as to what really is at stake or who actually is behind the scenes when these petitions are presented to us * * *?" The Philbrick article is Christian Herald's first answer to that question.

The forum of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee was held in New York City on January 30 and 31. One of the forum sessions was accorded the hospitality of the First Presbyterian Church. But on January 19 the morning newspapers carried the story of the withdrawal of these three men, formerly named as "sponsors and participants": Rev. Dr. George R. Buttrick, senior minister of the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York City, and a former president of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America; Dr. Paul Tillich, professor of philosophical theology at Union Theological Seminary; and Dr. Hadley Cantril, professor of psychology of Princeton University. Dr. Tillich, in a letter to Dr. Paul Lehmann, professor of applied Christianity at Princeton Theological Seminary and chairman of the Civil Liberties Committee, emphasized the fact that he had accepted sponsorship of the forum only on the strength of Dr. Lehmann's name and that of other sponsors, among them Dr. Buttrick. Dr. Buttrick declined to comment on his withdrawal—his withdrawal spoke for itself. Certainly many men who have remained on these and other "committees" are loyal Americans, too, but they will do well to reexamine their position even as these four have done. President John A. Mackay of Princeton Theological Seminary, who published his support of American recognition of Red China and the admission of Peiping to the United Nations, who reaffirmed that support and has never withdrawn it, remained on this committee. I do not question his purpose to be a loyal citizen of this country. But liberals do not easily withdraw. However, the courage to withdraw may be of higher degree than the stubbornness to remain.

In the spring of 1943, I was in North Africa with the American Army, accredited as a war correspondent and engaged in special activities with the Chaplains Corps. By cable I was invited to join the Friends of Russia in Philadelphia.

Among those extending the invitation was my friend, President Robert Livingston Johnson, of Temple University. I joined. President Johnson withdrew before I did, but I withdrew. I was constantly overseas between 1941 and 1946. I lost track of my home commitments until a thoughtful friend called my attention to my membership on this all-out subversive committee—a committee we had joined in high war fever when we were admonished to “understand our great ally, Russia.” Three years ago I was waited on by a courteous representative of the FBI. He inquired about my membership on this particular committee. I discovered, of course, that he already had the facts—all of them. More, he showed me a sheet on which I was listed by the Soviet Embassy in Washington as an American citizen “to be cultivated.” That morning I came face to face with the fact that the FBI had come not to smear but to clear. One of New York’s famous preachers, a man of vast and worthy influence both within and beyond his faith, was chairman of a committee on Russian relief. He visited Moscow. Presently his loyalty was seriously challenged. It was the FBI that got the facts and cleared that worthy name.

The FBI has been hardly less alert in establishing the integrity of both clergymen and laymen who have been misled and deceived than it has been relentless in ferreting out perjurers, subversives, and traitors.

The question is not, “Where was I then and why?” but “Where am I here and now?” The question of Dr. Herbert Gezork is germane. Herbert Philbrick’s article, *The Communists Are After Your Church*, is one of the answers.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Philbrick has stated that this expresses his opinion with regard to Communists in religion.

Mr. PHILBRICK. I would like to state one other thing for the benefit of the committee. First of all, I got into this Communist Party movement completely by accident in the very beginning because I was a Christian youth worker and very active in the Christian youth field. That is why the Communist Party came to me in the very beginning. I looked like a first-class sucker to them, I suppose, interested in world peace, a pacifist, and so they invited me to join a wonderful pacifist organization, the Cambridge Youth Council.

(Representative Gordon H. Scherer returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. PHILBRICK. When it later developed that the Cambridge Youth Council was in fact a phoney, fraudulent operation, I went to the FBI, and then after meeting with the FBI, decided to stay on in the Communist movement to discover what I could for the benefit of the United States Government.

The Communist Party has many levels of operation and many types of people who are members of the organization. I discovered many shocking facts during my 9 years in the party, but I can say in all sincerity to this committee that the most shocking discovery I made during the entire period of time was this particular aspect of Communist infiltration, the fact that they were indeed not only infiltrating the Christian movement and using it, but were planting these hardened, disciplined Communists who would pose as ministers of the Gospel. Now we have open Communist Party members who openly avow and reveal that they are indeed party members. I don’t worry very much about them.

There is then the pro group section, the underground section, the illegal section of the Communist Party, composed of the doctors and lawyers and teachers and professors. I think they are bad enough, but I think the Communist Party international conspiracy has indeed hit a new low when it has seized this means of working toward the overthrow of the United States Government and the control of the world as we know it today.

I know from information which has come into our Red underground operation at New York Herald Tribune that the efforts of the Communist Party have been stepped up tremendously toward using and victimizing the church people. I think it is of vital importance for this committee or for someone to study the facts, to investigate the situation, and to reveal the most complete and most accurate information you can possibly present to the American people in order that they may be warned, in order that they may not be victimized as they are now being victimized.

In the Red underground column in the Herald Tribune which we are now printing every other week in the Sunday edition, week after week information comes in to us showing that the Communist Party is having a vast amount of success in using church people. I am sure that this very vicious activity by the Communist Party should be curbed. The only way I know it can be curbed is by publicly revealing the facts and warning the people of the United States to be on their guard.

Mr. CLARDY. You are, of course, aware of the fact that the moment this committee or any member of it even so much as whispers anything about a minister, it is savagely attacked as being un-American itself and as heading toward the destruction of religion and all those sorts of things?

You are aware of that fact, I am sure.

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes; I know.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you have any advice on how we can go about letting the people of this country understand the true nature of the threat and the danger that really confronts us?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Well, I will agree that this is probably the toughest problem that any organization could ever tackle. The nearest example I can recall at this moment would be that of the Institute of Pacific Relations. I think perhaps that was one of the toughest jobs which any Government committee has ever sought to tackle.

Mr. CLARDY. Yes; in that case there was an immense propaganda machine dedicated to the destruction of the committee that was seeking to expose it.

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is true.

Mr. CLARDY. I think you must recognize the fact that there are literally thousands of good people, probably millions, spread about the country who instinctively react against any suggestion that any minister of the Gospel is either a Communist or a Communist dupe, and I am gravely concerned lest the committee be accused of doing something that it has no intention of doing; that is, of trying to do something to religion or to the churches, and I certainly speak as one who would like all the help you can give us in telling us how to tackle that problem.

Mr. PHILBRICK. Well, my own opinion would be that it would have to be tackled pretty much the same way the Senate committee tackled the IPR, and that was to build such a massive and such a complete volume of factual material and records that in the end it was impossible to refute.

Mr. CLARDY. I think you are right. We can agree, can't we, on one point, and that is that the church as such is not at all Communist in any sense of the word?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is certainly so, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. And that there is therefore no real danger from out-right Communists that can be identified as such. The danger is that good people will be misled and deluded into helping the Communists achieve their ends; is that what you are trying to say?

Mr. PHILBRICK. That is right, sir. You see, everything the Communist Party does is directed toward damaging the United States Government, damaging our way of life and strengthening the Soviet Union.

Mr. KUNZIG. That you know from your own personal knowledge?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes, sir. A Communist Party member himself, of course, will do everything in that direction. Now, as many more people as he can possibly convince to participate in a part of that program is an aid to the Soviet conspiracy.

Now, he may approach a minister or a church individual, and that church individual may be asked to contribute just one one-hundredth of the program, but if the Communist Party gets 100 people to contribute each of them one one-hundredth, he has them contributing 100 percent, and that is the way in which the party thinks in its planning toward achieving the objectives.

Mr. CLARDY. Any more questions?

Mr. KUNZIG. I have no more, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you have any questions, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. No.

Mr. CLARDY. How about you gentlemen?

Mr. WALTER. Do you think that the Communist Party should be outlawed?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I am beginning to come to that conclusion. I think when I appeared before the committee 2 years ago I still felt then that it would serve no real purpose because——

Mr. WALTER. That was the substance of your testimony then.

Mr. PHILBRICK. Because they would go underground. Today they are underground, so that argument doesn't hold any more. It might clarify things a bit.

I do know that so far as the Communist Party is concerned, they are prepared for it, and the minute that the Communist Party is outlawed, they will abolish the Communist Party and will form a new organization.

Mr. WALTER. Well, but we don't have to outlaw it by name. It is entirely possible to draft language that would outlaw that type of organization.

Mr. PHILBRICK. Yes. Well, it is simply that I know from sitting in at many of these meetings of the comrades themselves, they are ready immediately to take action to prevent any undue disturbance to the party organization.

Whether that can be solved legally or not, I don't know.

I do know that the party has legal experts, members of the National Lawyers' Guild, to advise them continuously on how to avoid any legal means the United States Government can take against them. However, it might still serve at this time as a beneficial move.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, do you think that the churches of this country, unaided and alone, can be depended on to discover these things you are talking about themselves without outside help?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I would say it would be virtually impossible for them to do so, sir, because it is virtually impossible for an outsider to learn any of the facts. It is virtually impossible for them to, and in fact, it is a pretty tough job for even this committee with all of its facilities to determine who is the vicious Communist and who is the innocent victim.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you think it would help that as these phony peace moves and other Communist-manipulated devices come along for this committee or some other committee to spread the word abroad as to the true nature of the movement in order to try to head it off?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I think so very much, sir, and that is exactly why we have the "Red Underground" column in the Herald Tribune, to try to do that. The only trouble is apparently this column appearing in just one newspaper in the country just doesn't do the job. We have had it running now for 2 years, in column after column, and I have many of them here.

We have reported and revealed Communist plans before they have taken place and yet I am astonished and disheartened to discover later that the Communists have still gone straight ahead and people have still fallen into these traps in spite of the fact that we have tried to warn them.

Mr. CLARDY. I don't think you have to feel too frustrated. This committee has been operating since 1938. It still meets the same thing you are talking about. I have been on it since only the first of the year, and I confess to a sense of frustration to find people still falling for it.

To come back to what I was getting at, wouldn't you say then that anything that this or any other governmental body or agency can do to educate the public generally, and the ministers as well, to what is really going on, what the Communist plot and plan are, would be helpful in defeating this?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Tremendously so; yes, sir. In fact, I think it is the only way. Now I read an article in This Week magazine 2 weeks ago by Bishop Oxnham, saying that he felt that such committees as this should be abolished and that the FBI should serve as the vehicle for fighting communism. Well, certainly I am the first to agree that the FBI is doing a magnificent job.

Mr. CLARDY. I will agree with you.

Mr. PHILBRICK. A wonderful job. However, all information which goes into the FBI is not public knowledge, cannot be learned by the public, and I think that we must have, in addition to the work that the FBI is doing, some means whereby the people can be told the facts. In no other way will they be able to intelligently combat this thing themselves, and I am sure they wish to.

Mr. CLARDY. I think you will also agree, since you have been through it yourself, that part of the equipment of a member of one of these committees is going to have to be a pretty thick skin.

Do you have anything more?

Mr. KUNZIG. Nothing further, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Philbrick, I have enjoyed listening to you very much. I have read your book with a great deal of interest, and if you think after this hearing is over of anything more that can be added to the record, I would appreciate your getting in touch with

counsel so we can figure out just how to get it into the record. Perhaps a supplemental report with the record reopened to be added to it might be helpful if you think of anything.

Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. CLARDY. All right; I shall leave the record open until such time as it has been cleared in the manner suggested.

Mr. KUNZIG. There is nothing further to come before the committee today, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. The witness is dismissed.

Show the hearings adjourned to 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 5:55 p. m., the hearing was recessed until 10 a. m., Tuesday, July 7, 1953.)

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE NEW YORK CITY AREA—PART 5

MONDAY, JULY 6, 1953

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON
UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
New York, N. Y.

EXECUTIVE SESSION ¹

The Subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities reconvened at 7:10 p.m., in New York, N. Y., Hon. Kit Clardy presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer, and Francis E. Walter.

Staff member present: Robert L. Kunzig, counsel.

Mr. CLARDY. The subcommittee will be in order.

Mr. KUNZIG, will you please call the witness.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Archibald Roosevelt.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I do.

Mr. CLARDY. Let the record show that the chairman has appointed a subcommittee consisting of Mr. Clardy, Mr. Scherer, and Mr. Walter for the purpose of this hearing.

All right, counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Roosevelt, you have volunteered to come in this afternoon before a Subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities as an Episcopal layman to give testimony of serious import on the question of communism amongst individuals in the field of religion.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. For the record, sir, would you state your full name?

TESTIMONY OF ARCHIBALD ROOSEVELT

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Archibald Roosevelt, A-r-c-h-i-b-a-l-d R-o-o-s-e-v-e-l-t.

Mr. KUNZIG. Your address?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Cold Spring Harbor, Long Island.

Mr. KUNZIG. Could you, for the record, give just a brief résumé, sir, of your background?

¹ Released by the full committee.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am a citizen of New York State, Cold Spring Harbor, Long Island. I am an investment banker and a layman of the Episcopal Church.

Mr. WALTER. Born in the United States?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Born in the United States.

Mr. CLARDY. And your illustrious forebear, sir, should be identified.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Son of Theodore Roosevelt.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you state, sir, for the record a bit of your war record, which we know has been distinguished.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I was in the infantry in World War I, 26th Infantry, First Division; wounded in World War I; with the 162d Infantry in New Guinea in World War II and wounded in World War II.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Roosevelt, as an Episcopal layman your testimony before this subcommittee would, of course, be in the nature of expert testimony in this particular field; therefore, opinion evidence is not only admissible, but is vitally important.

Would you be so kind as to give your opinion of the present danger, if you believe there is any, of Communist infiltration through various individuals in the field of religion?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Well, sir, there is no doubt that as an institution the church is a magnificent one. Few outside Russia will say that religion is not a necessity for right living and right thinking, but the church, like governments, is made up of men. Religion must be taught by men just as are secular studies in schools and in colleges; and the men in the church and the men teaching religion have in their organization all sorts of men—wise men and foolish men, good men, and bad men.

It has always been the endeavor of tyrannies either to abolish religion or to rule and control it.

We know only too well that the Communists in this country are trying to do both, and they have in some cases succeeded. As in the colleges and in the Government, the Communists have managed to infiltrate into key positions, and there is only one way we can stop and reverse the trend in our churches—and that is complete exposure and pitiless publicity.

There is no better method of attaining this than by the media of the duly elected representatives of the people—the Congress of the United States, through its committees; and, fortunately, Congress has seen and is doing its duty.

Our Congress, under our Constitution and laws, cannot hale individuals up for execution and prison as can dictators; they can only expose the facts and then the citizens can take such action as they, the citizens, deem fit—all statements by Communists and their deluded followers to the contrary.

Only believers in tyranny or those who have committed shameful actions fear such publicity as comes from the actions of the responsible committees of the Congress.

It is those people who start the cries of "witch hunt," "book burning," "freedom of speech," "academic freedom," "freedom of the press," and so forth, whenever an investigation is started by the Congress. The great pity is that many good people have been deluded by these shrill cries and have followed the leadership of the Communists as published by the Communist newspaper, the Daily Worker. The editorials by the Daily Worker are parroted

by their dupes, and as a result, many of our most respectable people are strangely silent when it comes to attacking Communists, and they follow the lead of the Daily Worker in attacking those who would expose such termites.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Roosevelt, I think that is a marvelous exposition, and I commend you, but let us get back to the original theme on which we started, if you don't mind.

Suppose you tell us something about your views as to individuals in the churches, and whether or not in your judgment there should be some concrete investigations by this committee.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Congressman, in the New York Times of today on the front page there were a great many excerpts from sermons of ministers given on Sunday, and all of them were vilifying the congressional investigations on communism. I wonder if these ministers have been recently reading the New Testament and remember the saying of Christ, "Render unto Caesar those things which are Caesar's, and render unto God those things which are God's."

As an Episcopalian, I feel that a great many of our ministers have forgotten that saying of Christ and are so busy telling Caesar what he should do that they are not rendering the proper service to God, which is helping the individual man and woman in his or her personal spiritual problems.

Mr. CLARDY. Then, Mr. Roosevelt, if I understand your position correctly, you are suggesting that you are deeply troubled about what you regard as an infiltration into the minds, at least, of some of the members of the clergy, and you think something should be done about it; is that a fair statement?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think, Mr. Congressman, that is a masterpiece of understatement. I am horrified at what some of our clergy have been doing and saying. As I said before, I am an Episcopalian. I love my church; I love the services; I love its tradition. The trouble is that some of the men who are responsible for the church have not understood their duty. Their duty is to save souls, not to save forms of government or advocate alien causes.

I believe the large portion of the clergy in our church are fine citizens. Unfortunately a great many of those fine citizens have been deluded by the machinations of a few un-Christian, disloyal people.

Mr. CLARDY. May I suggest to you, we have had some rather considerable testimony indicating to us quite clearly that part of the Communist plot to destroy religion and ultimately to destroy all the free world is to insert their ideas into the minds of individual clergymen so that they may have help and assistance in disseminating them. If I understand what you are saying, you think that you have detected that thing also?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That, Mr. Congressman, is entirely true, and I am prepared, with the help of some others, to give you documentary and testamentary proof of that, that there was a deep-laid plot which has been quite successful to poison the minds of good people, unsuspecting and fine people, in furthering the Communist programs.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Roosevelt, would you say then that the true Christian today would resist with all the fervor he can summon up this ungodly movement that we are talking about and that one of the ways to save the church is to do just what you have been advocating?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Congressman, I don't know that I can qualify to be a good Christian, but I try—with only moderate success—but I also realize that I have to have the help as a layman in the Episcopal Church from people like you.

I understand that you are a Methodist.

Mr. CLARDY. No, I belong to another Protestant——

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Velde is a Methodist.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I understand Chairman Velde is a Methodist, but I think that we have the same ideals and thoughts, and I think we understand our Government; and our Government, unlike what many people would believe, did not spring full-panoplied from the head of Zeus, as did Pallas Athena. It is built up of traditions and historical facts.

We are still a republic, which is the Latin for “respublica,” meaning “public affairs” and taken from the original Roman republic; and in the days of the Roman republic, when it was at the height of its strength, there was a Roman saying: “Let the Consuls look to it that the Republic is not endangered.”

In the days when our republic is so endangered, as it is now, let our Congress look to it that treason is exposed.

The people can take care of the situation once they know the facts.

Mr. KUNZIG. Thank you very much, sir, for your valuable testimony.

(Whereupon, at 7:40 p. m., the hearing adjourned until 10:30 a. m., July 7, 1953.)

×

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE NEW YORK CITY AREA—PART 6

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

JULY 7, 1953

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1953

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois, *Chairman*

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

KIT CLARDY, Michigan

GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

CLYDE DOYLE, California

JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR., Tennessee

ROBERT L. KUNZIG, *Counsel*

FRANK S. TAVENNER, JR., *Counsel*

LOUIS J. RUSSELL, *Chief Investigator*

THOMAS W. BEALE, Sr., *Chief Clerk*

RAPHAEL I. NIXON, *Director of Research*

CONTENTS

Testimony of—	Page
Joseph Zack Kornfeder-----	2035
Joseph Z. Kornfeder Exhibit No. 1-----	2039
Vladimir Petrov-----	2059
Benjamin Gitlow-----	2069
Leonard Patterson-----	2136
Patterson Exhibit No. 1-----	2139

(NOTE.—Index to this volume will be printed at end of "Investigation of Communist Activities in the New York City Area—Part 8.")



PUBLIC LAW 601, 79TH CONGRESS

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress [1946], chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, * * **

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RULE X

SEC. 121. STANDING COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

(A) Un-American activities.

(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

RULES ADOPTED BY THE 83^d CONGRESS

House Resolution 5, January 3, 1953

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress, the following standing committees:

(q) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

17. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American Activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time, investigations of (1), the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE NEW YORK CITY AREA—PART 6

TUESDAY, JULY 7, 1953

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SUBCOMMITTEE
OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
New York, N. Y.

EXECUTIVE SESSION ¹

The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to call, at 10:30 a. m., in room 1305 of the United States Courthouse, Foley Square, New York, N. Y., Hon. Gordon H. Scherer presiding.

Committee member present: Representative Gordon H. Scherer.

Staff members present: Louis J. Russell, chief investigator; Alvin W. Stokes, investigator; and Larry Kerley, special investigator.

Mr. SCHERER. The hearing of the committee will be in session.

Let the record show that the Honorable Harold H. Velde, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, has appointed the Honorable Kit Clardy, the Honorable Francis E. Walter, and the Honorable Gordon H. Scherer as a subcommittee for the purpose of conducting today's hearings. Messrs. Clardy and Walter are attending to other phases of its work and I am conducting this particular hearing.

Show that Mr. Louis Russell is the counsel for the committee in this instance.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give in this hearing shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. KORNFEDER. I do.

TESTIMONY OF JOSEPH ZACK KORNFEDER

Mr. RUSSELL. Will you state your full name?

Mr. KORNFEDER. My name is Joseph Zack Kornfeder.

Mr. RUSSELL. When and where were you born?

Mr. KORNFEDER. I was born in Slovakia, March 20, 1897.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Kornfeder, you have appeared before the committee on previous occasions, have you not?

Mr. KORNFEDER. I have.

Mr. RUSSELL. But you never testified on the subject of alleged Communist infiltration of religious groups?

Mr. KORNFEDER. No; I never have.

¹ Released by the full committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Kornfeder, have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. KORNFEDER. I have.

Mr. RUSSELL. Would you furnish the committee with a brief résumé of your activities while in the Communist Party?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Yes; I will. I joined the Communist Party at the same time the Communist Party was formed back in 1919. I had been a member of the Socialist Party before that, and I went with the wing of the Socialist Party that split away from that party and formed the Communist Party.

The first office I held in the newly formed Communist Party was branch organizer in the local section of New York City, after which I became a section organizer which took in the local section in Harlem, also New York City, and was then district organizer, which took in the entire New York State and upper New Jersey and Connecticut at that time.

In the course of holding these offices, I also became a member of the district bureau, Communist Party, in the New York area; a member of the central committee, now known as the National Committee of the Communist Party of the United States, and I held these various offices between 1920 and 1927. I was during that period also in charge of the Communist Party's labor-union activities nationally for about 2 years and in the New York area for the rest of the period mentioned.

In 1927, I was sent to Moscow for additional training, and I attended the Lenin School in Moscow, U. S. S. R., which is a political-warfare-training college, and while there I was attached to the Communist International headquarters for 2 years.

I attended most of the meetings of the various leading committees that took place at Communist International headquarters.

Mr. SCHERER. Let me interrupt. That was in Moscow that you attended these meetings about which you are telling us?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. All right.

Mr. KORNFEDER. At the same time I was a member of the Anglo-American Secretariat of the Communist International, representing the Communist Party of the United States on that secretariat.

During the same period of my stay in Moscow, I was for 3 years on a number of the subcommittees of the Red International Labor Unions, known as the Profintern, and attended all of its conferences, meetings, and congresses.

I departed from Moscow in the spring of 1930 as a representative of the Communist International on a mission to South America. I was in South America 2 years organizing Communist parties in Colombia and Venezuela, after which I returned toward the end of 1932 and was put in charge by the Politbureau of the Communist Party here in the United States of activities in the labor unions and industry in the New York-New Jersey area.

In about 1933, the early part of 1933, I was transferred to the Ohio area in charge of the party organization infiltrating industry and labor unions, with headquarters in Cleveland, Ohio.

I quit the Communist Party in the fall of 1934.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you say you quit the Communist Party in the fall of 1934?

Mr. KORNFEDER. That is right.

Mr. SCHERER. Would you tell us, Mr. Kornfeder, why you quit the Communist Party in 1934?

Mr. KORNFEDER. The party at that time executed one of its zigzags in policy, and I did not agree with the new change; and also I had, as a result of my stay in Russia, become suspicious of the soundness of the theory and practice of the Communist Party. So, this additional factor of my disagreement on an issue of policy that involved my activities in labor unions sort of brought into a climax my disagreements with them.

Mr. SCHERER. What was it particularly you found in Russia that was one of the factors that caused you to leave the party?

Mr. KORNFEDER. The thing that shocked me in Russia particularly was the arrest of the Trotskyites. Until then the theory and practice of the Communist movement was that you could use any method whatsoever against the class enemy, but inside of the Communist family, if there were any disputes, police methods should not be used to resolve these disputes, and this was the first time that police methods were used to eliminate a group that had a dispute on matters not of the doctrine but on the subject of applications of policy.

Mr. SCHERER. What were those police methods that were used, briefly?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Well, Leon Trotsky, who, when I came to Moscow, was still a member of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party, but had been removed from the Politburo of the Russian Communist Party, was arrested and deported, and subsequently they rounded up all his followers, which included thousands and thousands of party members, many of whom had been very outstanding personalities in the Bolshevik seizure of power and the civil war that followed it. This was a tremendous shock to me; that is, the use of police methods to solve disputes inside—

Mr. SCHERER. What did they do with these people that they rounded up as you say?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Most of them were put into what they call "isolators," political prisons, where they were kept entirely incommunicado, both with reference to any contact outside or any contacts in the prison with anybody else that may be there.

Mr. SCHERER. You yourself were in Russia at the time this took place; is that right?

Mr. KORNFEDER. That is right.

This was one of the things that shocked me.

Another thing that made an unfavorable impression on me is the terrific poverty which was contrary to the propaganda that the Communists disseminated outside of Russia—I mean, really excruciating poverty, while everything possible was being done to build up armament industries and armaments.

The third factor was that it was obvious already then that any of the so-called internal democracy in the Russian Communist Party was on the way out, and this was going to become a personal dictatorship on the part of Joseph Stalin.

Mr. SCHERER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. RUSSELL. Would you describe the Anglo-American Secretariat briefly, as to what it was?

MR. KORNFEDER. Yes. The Anglo-American Secretariat was a body composed of representatives of the Communist Party in English-speaking countries, United States, England, Canada, Australia, and so on, and it was the body through which were processed all material, reports, et cetera, that came from the Communist Party in those countries, and on the basis of these reports, written and oral, recommendations were designed by the Anglo-American Secretariat to be passed on to the upper levels for instructions to the Communist Party in those countries.

It was the one that intimately discussed all particulars as to activities of these Communist Parties and received all the reports from there—minutes for the Politburo, the district committees, the party factions, labor unions, and everything else of any consequence whatsoever that reflected the activities of the Communist Party of the United States, which were received and read, on the basis of which instructions were forwarded to the Communist Party in the United States.

MR. RUSSELL. Would you briefly describe the Lenin School?

MR. KORNFEDER. The Lenin School is a college that trains the officer personnel for the Communist Parties outside of Russia. Every Communist Party in the more developed countries, like Germany, England, France, United States, Italy, would send their more able members or officials to that school for training.

The training, if I may outline it briefly, includes the following subjects: Leninism—Leninism is the method of conquering power and preparing for the seizure of power and what to do after the seizure of power—that is, the whole art of conquering a state and preparing for the conquest of a state of the labor, the masses, psychologically prior to it and how to organize for that purpose.

It is on the subject of Leninism that a topic like how to combat religion was discussed. Another subject that would be gone into extensively is what they call the structure of the party. That is the type of party like the Communist Party which is a civil-war organization. It is not the type of party that we are accustomed to call political parties.

Now, how such a party should work and organize its activities and control its members and control other organizations that infiltrate, that is the whole problem of tactics and techniques of organization inside the capitalist countries which would be gone into under the heading of the structure of the party.

I may mention two more subjects which are of key importance, and that is how to organize factory workers in the labor unions and how to penetrate labor unions and capture them from within and generally the whole topic of how to form and utilize front organizations, both in the more advanced countries and in colonial areas with Communist Party—not based on the factory workers, but on the peasants.

One final point—

MR. SCHERER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

MR. KORNFEDER. One final point which was a 3 months' course out of the 3 years, and I may say that is a very intensive training, the whole time, the entire 3 years, when I spent about 16 hours a day either in classes or reading assigned material pertaining to the subjects assigned, and that includes 10½ months a year, and in the remaining 6 weeks that you have each year you spent attached to the various

party controlled government institutions in order to see how the Communist Party in control of government operates.

The final topic at the end of all this training was what they called the military. This takes in the whole problem of how to prepare for an insurrection in the immediate sense. There are plans on how to seize a city, what key spots to seize; how to prepare command groups, how to case each objective, how to obtain armament for these groups, how to do away with the principal leaders of the other side in the early part of the insurrection; and what to do immediately after one seizes a city.

This is gone through in tremendous detail, and the instructors are from the military colleges. There are officers who specialize in the problems of the revolutionary seizure of power in foreign countries. Some of them had participated in such things, both during the Russian revolution and during the various uprisings in China, in Germany, and other countries.

That includes arms training also for those who need it; that is, if there was a Communist who never was in the armed forces and did not know how to handle a rifle or machinegun, he was afforded the opportunity of learning how to handle these things by being taken to Red Army barracks and going through the necessary practice in the matter.

In this brief statement I have summarized the training that is received in the Lenin School.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Kornfeder, you furnished a copy of the curriculum at the Lenin University as existed at the time you attended the school.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to insert it in the record at this time.

Mr. SCHERER. It will be inserted.

(The material above referred to is as follows:)

JOSEPH Z. KORNFEDER EXHIBIT No. 1

CURRICULUM, LENIN UNIVERSITY, MOSCOW, U. S. S. R.

TEXTBOOKS ON MILITARY SUBJECTS

(NOTE.—The instructors on military subjects were all Red Army staff officers of the high command. They perform under party names and often are not at all introduced to the students; they just take charge. Occasionally a known member of the high command like Marshal Simeon Budone lectured in Russian on this subject. The staff officers instructing are men who specialize on foreign military problems and participated in the events they are instructing about.)

Textbooks

On War, by Clausewitz, the Karl Marx of German military theory. (Translated from German.)

Construction of the Red Army During the Revolution, by Antonov Ovseyenko. (Translated from Russian.)

The Civil War, Military Problems and Civilian, by Bubnov. (Translated from Russian.)

Strategy of Civil War, composite book by Bubnov, Kamenev, and Eydemann. (Translated from Russian.)

Red Army and Civil War Politics, by S. T. Gussev, former representative of the Comintern to the United States, under name of "Green."

Fighting During the Revolution, by Bukharin.

The Class War, by Tuchachevsky. (Translated from Russian.)

Civil War Politics and Insurrection. Excerpts from Lenin's writings.

Political and ideological preparation for armed insurrection.—Key theme: (1) Everyday politics have no sense unless it is consciously preparatory to the armed

struggle for power; or (2) insurrection is a continuation of everyday politics by means of arms.

Precondition for successful armed insurrection.—(1) Economic collapse and chaos in the country; (2) demoralization and dissention among the governing circles; (3) defeat of the government in a foreign war or its inability to keep things moving as a result of exhaustion following the war; (4) ability of the party to take advantage of the situation.

The "peaceful" phase of preparation

Ideological and organizational penetration of Armed Forces (Army, Navy, police, etc.).—Main theme: To foster antimilitarism and hatred of officers, alleged objective rank and file; democratization of Army, Navy, etc. Main objective: Demoralization and decomposition. Subsidiary objectives: Training of young Communists in the use of arms and information on status and disposition of forces and armament.

Instruments to be created and used for that purpose: (1) Young Communist League; (2) student unions, clubs, or leagues; (3) front organizations like the Youth Congress, auxiliary instruments, teachers' unions, parents' associations, etc.

Peaceful organization and penetration of strategic services.—Organization of trade and industrial unions; in maritime and land transports, such as the National Maritime Union, transport-workers union, longshore and warehousemen, etc.

Auxiliary—unions in the communications systems—radio, telegraph, and telephone, like the American Communications Association.

Organization of strategic production services—like unions among oil and refinery workers; die and tool, instrument workers; automobile, aircraft, and vehicle workers; chemical workers; electrical, machine, and radio workers, etc.

Technical intelligence organizations—like the association of technicians, engineers, chemists, etc.

Organizations for penetration of government.—Unions of county, municipal, and government employees; office and professional workers; Labor Party and Progressive Party clubs and leagues; infiltration of Democratic or Republican Parties.

Demoralization and disinformation instruments.—American Newspaper Guild, Teachers' Unions, American Association of Writers and Artists, American Peace Mobilization, committees of liberals, and clergymen for various purposes, International Juridical Association, Lawyers Guild, etc.

(NOTE.—This gives only a rough idea of the theme behind the mosaic of innocents and "front" organizations basic and auxiliary fostered by the Communist Party under Comintern direction.)

Tremendous attention is paid by the Comintern to the creation in popular form of labor confederations like the CIO even if not fully controlled, it gives their unions within it a big backdrop and reach. This mosaic of organizations once created can then be utilized to profit from any crisis, confusion, or misfortune that may befall the country in which they operate or else be stimulated or driven in one direction or other according to the needs of Moscow's foreign policy.

They can be utilized on a vast scale for political sabotage, that is, stimulated strikes where it hurts most.

Demonstrations disconcerting to the morale of the public, and continued crescendo of demoralization propaganda. The inner intent of which is in strategic parlance, "defeat"—of what Moscow considers as its enemies. Democracies are of course considered favored playground and easy marks for this sort of machinations.

Actual physical sabotage becomes possible on an effective scale once the masses are sufficiently charged and wired by such ideological preparations. Physical sabotage is, however, considered secondary to political sabotage and is carried out only by specially instructed select groups in places and moments where it may count most.

In order to get the masses involved into these machinations, the mosaic of organizations sponsor what the masses consider good for them. This "progressive" front shingle has the liberals entangled. In essence, the movement aims at a reactionary overturn of our institutions carried out by revolutionary means.

The technique and methods for this were, of course, developed gradually as the Russian revolution settled down to stark reaction.

During a revolutionary situation, the creation of which is stimulated by these types of machinations, the activity of this mosaic of organizations can be stepped up as indicated further on.

The average party member himself scarcely knows the pattern or intent of the top strategists, but, being mentally conditioned, welcomes and accepts it as it unrolls.

Intensified preparation for armed insurrection

Intensification of antimilitarist activity among armed forces. (Objective: Demoralize, neutralize, recruit.) France is example. Advantage of conscript army. (Hatred of officer corps.)

Organization on a large scale of a semimilitary, sports organizations, youth clubs, of many varieties. Intensified emphasis on penetration of non-Communist and semimilitary youth and other organizations.

Organization and preparation of assault groups: Training and hardening of the groups in "peacetime" warfare; organized heckling and breakup of enemy meetings and demonstrations; terrorization of opponents by assaults; punishment of "bad" cops; organized street brawls; protecting a demonstration; peacetime demonstrations in quasi-military form; practicing on scabs.

Procurement of armament: Procurement of arms from arsenals, depots, barracks and armament factories, etc. Assaults on arms stores and isolated police or constabulary stations and cops to obtain arms. Smuggling across border and by seas. Machine shops as arsenals. (Buying of arms, Molotov cocktails, homemade bombs, etc.)

Preparation and organization of sabotage (state of tension and panic).—Political sabotage: Stimulation of strikes, demonstrations, street fights, with emphasis on strategic industry. Temporary capture and operation of radio stations. Sabotage of government from the inside. (Direct sabotage.) Rail and transport sabotage, organized incendiarism, equipment sabotage.

The planning of the uprising.—Assignment of objectives to the assault groups and commandos. Thorough investigation of objectives and planning of each individual assault. The theory of engaging and destroying the enemies' vital forces and occupying vital central points. The method of arming "left" elements, mopping up, and forming the Red guard. The strategy of absolute surprise. The strategy of relative surprise: Hamburg, Canton. The national aspect—interior lines: Marching to support government demoralization, Russian revolution. Periphery to center. German revolution.

Techniques of agrarian insurrection.—Advantage of terrain, distance, and camouflage. Guerrilla raids. The technique of diversion. Expropriation-raids. Raids on outposts, night activity.

Political and philosophical preparation for seizure of power. Leninism

Strategy of singling out the working class and setting it apart or against all other classes.

Strategy of organizing a party out of the disaffected and pauperized intelligentsia to lead the working class, which particularly in agrarian countries is considered unfit to lead itself.

The concept of party as a political army engaged in constant maneuvering and warfare and capable of rapid transformation into an armed military force. The use of other classes, peasants, middle classes, etc., as strategical allies in the capture of power.

The transition from a party of revolutionary opposition to a party in power. Stalin completed that transition by destroying the old party and its principal components and creating gradually a new one.

History of the labor movement

The concept that the history of society is the history of continuous class struggles.

The concept that authority of government is based on a body of armed men in the service of a particular class and that the problem is to create or possess oneself of that instrument.

The history of labor is the history of rebellion against the master class from the time of Roman Empire (Spartacus rebellion) to our time.

The Bolshevik (Leninist) concept of conquering power combines all the best out of the experience of the past brought to date. Other movements like the Socialists, anarchists, syndicalists, etc., are ailments and deviations surviving out of the infantile past.

Marxian economics

The theory according to which the workers produce all wealth, receive enough only for their minimum sustenance, while all others live off their backs.

The theory of the inevitable economic exhaustion and decay of capitalism through its own greed, and dog-eat-dog conflicts creating a condition for its early destruction by the party of the revolution.

The theory of the abolition of private ownership in the means of production and distribution and its replacement by government ownership (state capitalism) as a transitory economy on the way to socialism.

The theory that a one-party monopoly over the government is essential in order to guide the masses through this difficult economic process on the way to socialism.

Marxism as modified by Lenin's strategical formulas and the needs of Stalin's policies:

1. Imperialism is interpreted to suit the strategical purpose of organizing rebellion in the colonies against England, France, Japan, and to subvert (sic) Latin America against the United States.

2. Theory of independence of small nations is strategically utilized to create as much division as possible in non-Russian Europe and elsewhere.

3. Theory of inevitable decay and collapse of empires to create faith in the sure victories of national independence movements under Russian inspiration and attract them within the orbit of Russian power politics.

Anything ever written or said by Bolshevik, Socialist, anarchist, liberal, or reactionary leaders that could be quoted, interpreted, etc., to substantiate said strategical theories and create a fanatical conviction about them is made available to the students.

Case in point: The famous black-belt theory, to sublimate the southern Negro with the mirage of "national liberation" and independence.

Dismemberment and exhaustion of empires aimed at without regard to consequences to populations involved.

SUBJECT: *Mental Conditionings of Party Members and Workers*.—In order that civil war can be led into a direction desired by Moscow, a thorough preparation is needed; this presupposes the creation of an insurrectionary mentality; only those thus mentally enmeshed can mentally charge the masses with the opiates necessary. Mental civil war precedes the physical civil war; to be able to shoot mental, and thence physical, bullets is the aim of the philosophical training received.

Textbooks and teachers are conditioned by that purpose.

Textbooks on curriculum subjects

Economics—Karl Marx, Fredrick Engels, N. Lenin, Malstus, Ricardo, Smith, Hiefferding, etc.

Politics—Lenin, Stalin, Marx, Bebel, Bernstein, Kautzky, LaSalle, Bismark, Bukharin, Backunin, etc.

Organization—Lenin, Stalin, Piatnitzky, Gussev, Derchinsky, Sverdlov, Piatakov, etc.

(NOTE.—Outside of Marx' Capital which most students find difficult to digest mentally, the other authors are given in excerpts and parts or heavily criticized. Many of the above-mentioned authors, Russian and foreign, have since been purged and their books disappeared. If their ideas in part are essential to the teaching of the system, other authors have been given the privilege to present it as their own.)

TEACHERS STAFF

Vyacheslav Molotov, head of the university, chairman of the Council of Peoples Commissars and present foreign commissar. Also head of Comintern (Dimitrov being titular head only). Subject: Soviet Politics and Tasks of the Comintern.

Ossip Piatnitzky, organization (former) secretary of the Comintern. Subject: Organization Politics of the Comintern.

Otto Kuusinen, active politico of the presidium of the Comintern. Recently head of the provisional government set up by Stalin during the Finnish invasion. Subject: Politics and Strategy of the Comintern.

S. Losovsky, head of the trade-union department of the Comintern and assistant foreign commissar. Subject: Trade Union Politics of the Comintern.

(NOTE.—These are only the most prominent of the teachers at the Lenin University, the routine staff used to consist of Rudasz, Mingulin, Kirsienova, etc. All the heads of Comintern departments teach there, like Vasiliev, Ercoli, Petrovsky, etc.)

P. S.—This outline as to what is taught at the Lenin School, a political-warfare college, was prepared in 1944 from notes taken at the Lenin School. To make it

intelligible to Americans, suitable names and illustrations were used. The CIO has since cleaned out its Communist-controlled unions and there have been other changes.

/s/ JOSEPH Z. KORNFEDER.

Mr. RUSSELL. During your attendance at the Lenin School how was the subject of religion discussed? That is, were methods of infiltration of religious groups discussed at the Lenin School?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Oh, yes, definitely so. Religion, like all other subjects, was discussed on the basis of Communist experience in Russia or Germany or China. These were the principal parties at the time, but mainly on the basis of experience in Russia, so since religion is considered a hostile ideology to communism and not only hostile ideology, but an organization that has an organizational base, namely, the churches. It was gone into at some length.

Religion and the church are considered a major enemy. The question of tactics, how to combat it, is considered of utmost importance. So the thing was discussed on the basis of two approaches; one, the atheistic one, how to attack the church from the outside; and the other one, how to attack it from the inside by infiltration from inside the church.

At that time both methods were in use; that is, the Soviet Government had created a specialized organization known as the Society of the Godless, Soviet Union, led by one Yaroslowsky, Emil Yaroslowsky.

Mr. RUSSELL. Spell that.

Mr. KORNFEDER. Y-a-r-o-s-l-a-w-s-k-y. Yaroslowsky's wife was, by the way, assistant director of the Lenin School, and Yaroslowsky himself lectured on this topic several times before the trainees of the school.

This organization had the specified job with the whole support of the Government of combating religion. It had its groups and spies inside of the church, and it made a specialized concentrated job like the Communists usually do when they concentrate upon organization, except that in this case it was an organization that had at the same time the full support of the Government and particularly of its secret political police and utilized that support fully.

I may at this time, just to establish the fact that Communists are basically atheists, introduce some quotations from their own writings, if that is in order.

Mr. SCHIERER. We would like to have them put in the record.

Mr. KORNFEDER. This is taken out of the program of the Communist International, adopted at the Sixth World Congress held in Moscow in the latter part of 1928 at which I was present. It was published here in the United States by the Workers Library Publishers, New York, a Communist Party publishing setup, and the following appears on page 53:

One of the most important tasks of the cultural revolution affecting the widest masses is the task of systematically and unswervingly combating religion—the opium of the people. The proletarian government must withdraw all state support from the church, which is the agency of the former ruling class; it must prevent all church interference in state-organized educational affairs, and ruthlessly suppress the counterrevolutionary activity of the ecclesiastical organizations. At the same time the proletarian state, while granting liberty of worship and abolishing the privileged position of the formerly dominant religion, carries on antireligious propaganda with all the means at its command and reconstructs the whole of its educational work on the basis of scientific materialism.

We said at the beginning of this introduction that Marxism cannot be conceived without atheism. We would add here that atheism without Marxism is incomplete and inconsistent. The decline of the bourgeois freethinkers' movement offers an instructive confirmation of this argument. Whenever materialism in science fails to develop into historical materialism, that is, into Marxism, it ends up in idealism and superstition.

I may also quote at this point Lenin's attitude toward religion.

Lenin, as I already indicated, was the founder of the Soviet State, and the entire method of how to conquer power. He put into the program of the Communist Party of Russia in March 1919, under the heading of "General Political Question," section 13, the following:

With regard to religion, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union does not confine itself to the already-decreed separation of the church and the state, and of the school and the church, that is, measures advocated in the programs of bourgeois democracy, which the latter has nowhere consistently carried out to the end owing to the diverse and actual ties which bind capital with religious propaganda.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is guided by the conviction that only the conscious and deliberate planning of all the social and economic activities of the masses will cause religious prejudices to die out. The party strives for the complete dissolution of the ties between the exploiting classes and the organization of religious propaganda, facilitates the real emancipation of the working masses from the religious prejudices, and organizes the widest possible scientific, educational, and antireligious propaganda. At the same time it is necessary carefully to avoid giving such offense to the religious sentiments of believers, as only leads to the strengthening of religious fanaticism.

I believe these two quotes from these basic sources establishes the fact that the Communist Party and its doctrines are solidly based on materialism which is an application to atheism. There is available on the subject of Communist atheism, of course, voluminous material. It is almost endless.

Mr. RUSSELL. At the beginning of your testimony you stated that two methods of attack against religion were discussed in the Lenin School in Moscow. Will you tell us what was meant by the attack from within the church?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Yes; but I think I should say more on the methods of outside attack, I mean, how the thing looked in practice.

Right at the beginning of the Soviet state, all church property was nationalized. This measure of nationalizing all church property was more important in the fight against the church than is realized in the West, because by depriving the church of all income except a few kopeks, pennies, they could collect from the parishoners, it dried up anywhere from 70 to 80 percent of the income of the church, the result of which was that many of the preachers and other church personnel were simply thrown upon the market to starve and to beg and to steal, if they could, in order to sustain themselves. This was particularly so in the big cities. This one single measure was an economic squeeze of unusual consequence and proportions upon the operations of the church. In another measure no religious literature could be printed because the Government had complete monopoly over everything to be printed. No one was allowed to even have a private mimeograph or anybody in possession of a duplicating machine. If they did, and were caught, they would be charged with counter-revolutionary activities, so there was no way or means of reproducing or producing religious literature. Even the Bible could not be reproduced. After the old copies would be used up, there was no more

Bible. So that was another squeeze, which was indirect, but was very effective.

Then teaching religion to the youth was absolutely forbidden. Anybody who would attempt to do that, of course, would be arrested for counterrevolutionary activities and get at least 10 years in a slave labor camp, so you could not teach religion to the youth, and, of course, you could not train new preachers. All religious seminaries were abolished and dissolved. In addition to that there were arrests of those preachers that they considered dangerous, and they would just disappear. But even more important than the arrests were all these other things. I still remember, sort of staring me in my face—I never was able to get the image out of my mind—one of those priests begging in the streets of Moscow, a fellow about 6 feet tall, emaciated, starved, but his eyes stared at me because he saw I was not a Russian, I did not wear Russian clothes, and he was trying to speak to me through his eyes. He was very timid about begging because he could be arrested for that, but apparently he was in such desperate straits that he took the risk, and his eyes just bored into me like magnets.

I wanted to give him a few rubles, but I was afraid that if somebody would see me, I would be accused of sympathizing with the class enemy, but even so I went around the block thinking that maybe there would be an occasion for me to slip him a few rubles, but by then he was gone. Outside of Moscow the spectacle of priests begging is more displayed because Moscow is a showcase, diplomatic service being there, the foreign corps, and so on, but in the cities other than Moscow you find priests begging—

Mr. SCHIERER. You mean the other cities of Russia?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Yes; of Russia—it was rather a general spectacle.

Well, this would, I think, to some extent indicate the practical methods of fighting the church. There are no religious manifestations allowed outside of the church. That is, you could not make religious parades through the streets, and no priest was permitted anywhere within sight, either in religious garb or with any religious symbols when there were state occasions like the First of May, or the anniversary of the seizure of power, and other special days. Any priest showing up in his garb anywhere during that day would be arrested, charged with counter-revolutionary activities.

The churches, as a result of these economic squeezes, particularly in the cities, became rather quickly dilapidated, so then they tore them down as eyesores, or they just took them over and transformed them into meeting halls or clubrooms or something like that, and of course the richer churches, the big edifices which were more difficult to maintain from a financial point of view and often were located at intersections, they would be torn down as traffic obstructions.

Mr. SCHIERER. Now, Mr. Kornfeder, you have described what happened to the churches and religious groups in Russia. Was anything taught in the school which you attended with reference to the infiltration of religious groups in countries which Russia sought eventually to dominate?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Oh, yes.

Mr. SCHIERER. Will you tell us about that?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Well, this was taught on the basis of their methods inside of the Russian church. The practices inside of the Russian church—at least they did not attack only from the outside, as indicated by what I have said, but they soon found that attack alone was not sufficient, because in the countryside, in the villages, the peasants just wouldn't go for that stuff, so when the Bolshevik leaders realized that this attack was not very effective outside of big cities, though of course in the big cities they had religion under threat, they could put the squeeze on in a big way, but in the villages it was different, so they designed a method out of which were fashioned the infiltration methods later on practiced in capitalist countries. They created a thing that became known as the living church movement. The living church movement was based on the idea of interpreting the teachings of Christ and the Apostles in a way that would serve to a large extent Communist purposes; that is, for instance, there is a part in the Bible which says that Christ chased the money changers out of the temple.

Well, that would be interpreted that Christ was an anticapitalist.

The part of Christ's story in the Bible of persecution under the Roman Empire and of Christianity being a movement against Roman slavery, that it was based on the work of the individual, as an individual was cleverly utilized to indicate that Christianity is a movement of the masses against the ruling classes. That is, all the things in the Bible or about the Apostles that could be used for a materialistic interpretation combined with the theological approach were utilized to fashion the ideology for their living church movement.

The reason they had the words "living church" is that the whole concept that they fashioned on that basis was that the church would be occupied itself with the problems of men on earth, whereas the old clergy ignored the problems of men on earth and were, as they say, pontificating into a vacuum something out of the reach of man. Whereas in the situation that existed in Russia at that time, this kind of an ideological approach had an effect, the living church movement was set up with the cooperation of the secret political police and was operated initially with the aid of the Metropolitan of Moscow.

The Metropolitan in this case is a high clergyman in the Greek Orthodox Church. He probably had very little choice in the matter. Of course, many of the clergymen, preachers and so on in the villages and very small towns eventually joined it, believing that it might do some good, and they were anxious for conciliation with the Soviet state. They had illusions that this living church movement would make that possible. Anybody who in subsequent years would resist joining the living church movement was eliminated, and what you have now as a remnant in Russia of a church, consists of the ones that had joined this living church movement. The general idea is to move from the spiritual concept to the materialistic one and to make the church an instrument of social strife. That is the psychological approach in this kind of an operation of working from inside of the church, and I may say that it was rather effective.

In the countries outside of Russia there were leaders of the Communist International. The Communist International was really but a subsidy of the Politbureau of the Russian Communist Party. They soon found out that the atheistic attack from outside is less effective than in Russia, and the way to combat religion in the

capitalist countries, the countries of the West, was to concentrate on the inside operation even though the inside operation is not an outright Communist proposition from point of view of neutralizing the church and confusing it, by creating a division in it. It was very effective, and it was during that time that they began to really study up on everything that could be learned from the reformation. They supplemented what could be learned from the reformation with Communist tactics and methods and created out of it what you have now in the United States in many writings.

Mr. RUSSELL. My understanding of the living church is that it is a substitute for pure atheism as practiced from within the Russian church itself.

Mr. KORNFEDER. It is a supplement to the attack from outside. The way that the outside attack is atheistic, straight atheistic attack—the attack from inside omits that phase, or introduces, as it were, atheism in diluted form. It does not combat or openly challenge the spiritualism of the church or the concept of the fatherhood of God. It does not challenge it. It even, when necessary, pays lip service to it, but it concentrates on the so-called social problems, all the problems that naturally could be exploited to create social strife between classes, races, competing church groups, and so on.

I may in this case, in this connection, introduce a quotation from Lenin so you can see that there is a basic concept behind this. This is from a booklet on religion by V. I. Lenin, published in the United States by International Publishers in 1933, pages 28 and 29.

I quote:

One of the most serious and dangerous mistakes Communists can make is to imagine that a revolution can be accomplished by the hands of revolutionists alone. On the contrary, in order that serious revolutionary work may be successful, it is necessary to understand and be guided by the fact that revolutionists can only play the role of the vanguard of the really advanced and progressive class. The vanguard fulfills its tasks as such only when it is able to keep in touch with the masses it leads, and actually lead the whole mass forward. Without a union with non-Communists, in the most varied fields of activity, successful Communist constructive effort is out of the question.

This was, by the way, quoted to us in the discussion on religion, and Piatnitski, who was at that time the organization secretary of the Comintern and who was present in this discussion, also quoted to us another part of Lenin, a very familiar one which said—I make a free-hand quotation—that Communists must work in all types of organizations, no matter how reactionary, including religion, even if they have to lie, practice deception, and resort to whatever sort of maneuvering may be necessary in order to stay in these organizations and carry out the Communist Party's program there.

Mr. SCHERER. They advocated that course of conduct by the Communist Party for combating religion then in the United States. Do I understand that is your testimony?

Mr. KORNFEDER. That is right; yes.

Mr. SCHERER. And that was taught to you in the Lenin School?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Yes; that was taught in the Lenin School.

Mr. SCHERER. Were there any other Americans there at this school at the same time you were there?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Oh, yes; yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Scherer, we have that in the record on previous occasions, that is, the identity of other students from the United States.

Mr. SCHERER. Yes; I do not want to get into that.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Kornfeder, your testimony thus far has involved what happened in Moscow when you were there in connection with the Communist effort to eliminate religion in Russia. The general belief in the United States is that if the Communists conquer the world, that religion would be abolished overnight, is that true?

Mr. KORNFEDER. No; I do not think so. The Communists have found out that religion is a stronger force ideologically than they originally suspected, and I believe that even if they would conquer, they would still utilize both forms of attack. Of course, the atheistic attack then would have much bigger chance than it had when they only conquered one country, namely, Russia, but I believe even they would still use both methods. Of course, the ultimate goal is the complete destruction of religion. This is only a matter of tactics. It does not mean that the Communists are accommodating themselves or intend to accommodate themselves to religion, but they love to get the results. If they can't get them directly, they use also the indirect method.

Mr. SCHERER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. KUNZIG. How successful were the tactics that you have described in Moscow during the period you were there?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Well, in Moscow they were very successful. Most of the important churches, by the time I had left, those that were not torn down for one reason or another, were transformed into clubs, meeting rooms. There was one church right near the Lenin School that was the Embassy quarter, all the various embassies were located near there, and they used to chime their bells, so whenever the church bells would annoy the Communists around, they would make a complaint, and they would silence the church bells, so this time they first silenced the church bells, and before I left, the church was no longer a church. It was a club room, but there were still left in Moscow by that time about, I think, 63 of the hundreds of churches that there used to be in Moscow.

That is the atheistic attack with all those features I enumerated before. The so-called living church movement also was going by then, but in Moscow, of course, it was not of very large proportions because the church had been organizationally demolished. But it was the headquarters for the living church movement, and they tolerated right on the Red Square what used to be the administrative building of the Russian Orthodox Church, including a portico where they allowed the religionists to keep a flame, a holy sort of symbol, burning as you entered the Red Square. That was there most of the time until about the last 2 months of my stay in Moscow, when they tore that down.

In Moscow both the atheistic attack as well as the infiltration attack had been quite effective. Of course, the Metropolitan in Moscow had several years before joined the living church movement for reasons I stated.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was there any opposition to the attempt of the Communists to take over the churches on the part of the Russian people while you were in Moscow?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Yes, there definitely was. There was considerable resistance, for instance, to it from the reformation that would be pipelined to those that were close enough to be in a circle, and there were

some rebellions against the Communists doing away with churches in certain areas of southern Russia which were put down by force. Of course, nothing ever appeared in the Russian newspapers, nothing ever appears on any rebellion inside Russia in the Russian newspapers, and the thing is suppressed not by use of the Red police or the Red Army forces which for such purposes are considered unreliable, but it is suppressed by the OGPU troops. The OGPU is the political police, which is a tremendous establishment which has its own military forces, and this military force is strictly selected. No one can be a part of OGPU regiment unless everything about him is known. He has been thoroughly indoctrinated and so on. These are the mercenary troops that they use for suppressing rebellions, including any resistance to the attack against the church.

There was one of these rebellions at the time in the Moslem territory around Batum, which they put down by force, and it was a religious rebellion, mixed in with other causes, but it came to a head because of the attempt to tear down some mosques in that area, and there were others in the southern part of the Ukraine. Those of us who were close enough to the upper circles at the time would learn about it, after the event, usually. It is this type of resistance that contributed to their going forth on the idea of working to fight against religion from the inside.

Mr. SCHERER. Fighting from the inside as opposed to the atheistic approach which was the attack on the church from without, and in which they used more violent methods; is that what you mean?

Mr. KORNFEDER. That is right; yes, that is right.

Mr. KUNZIG. In other words, they had to resort to a second line of attack in order to destroy or attempt to destroy it.

Mr. KORNFEDER. They had to resort to maneuvering in order to get to the same goal. The goal always remained the same, elimination, complete elimination, of the church and religion, but the methods as to how to go about it varied according to the circumstances.

Mr. SCHERER. What method is the Communist Party using in the United States to accomplish the elimination of religion eventually?

Mr. KORNFEDER. In the United States the attack is on what they would call the propaganda level; that is, indoctrination. They still maintain their position of atheism, but as for the popular approach, that is, what they would call agitation, they concentrate entirely on the method of boring from within the church laid down in that pattern I explained of the living church but adapted to conditions in the United States.

Mr. SCHERER. From your observation since you have been back in the United States, how have they used this method of infiltration?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Well, I think their pattern of infiltration can best be traced by a study of the methods of the Methodist Federation for Social Service headed by Harry F. Ward, reverend professor of religion, who was in Moscow on several consultations and who was the granddaddy, as it were, of how to apply—

Mr. SCHERER. You say Harry F. Ward was in Moscow on a number of occasions?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Can you tell us about his visits to Moscow?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Well, I never had him in a meeting of the American Secretariat or anything like that, but I know he was there.

Mr. SCHERER. When was he there?

Mr. KORNFEDER. I think in 1924 he was there and also, I believe, 1928 or 1929. He would never appear at Comintern Headquarters in any of these meetings.

Mr. SCHERER. For how long periods would he be there?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Oh, he, I believe, was there each time for several weeks.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you know what the purpose of his visits were to Russia?

Mr. KORNFEDER. The purposes of his visits would have to do with bringing the clergy that he could influence into the operations that had to do with foreign policy. That would be one aspect, and the other aspect, of course, would be to discuss with the leaders the movement that he was leading, the Methodist Federation for Social Service.

Mr. SCHERER. When you say discuss with the leaders, just tell us, if you know, with whom were these conferences held?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Well, I cannot tell you from first hand; that is, I was not at the conference, but—

Mr. SCHERER. We understand that, but what information do you have with reference to these conferences?

Mr. KORNFEDER. From what I heard I am sure he saw Yaroslowsky.

Mr. SCHERER. Again, who was Yaroslowsky?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Emil Yaroslowsky was the head of the Anti-God Society of the Soviet Union, and I am sure he saw Bukharin, who was at that time the head theoretician of the Communist International, and I am fairly certain in my mind that he also saw Joe Stalin, because Joe Stalin was very much interested in this living-church approach because he was the one that originally was in charge of it, in the Politbureau, Joe Stalin. In fact, when one studies the methods of the Methodist Federation, I wonder who learned from whom, whether it was Harry F. Ward who learned from Stalin or whether Stalin learned from Harry Ward. They probably learned from each other the methods as to how to do it inside the church.

Mr. SCHERER. You say how to do it. Tell us just what you mean by that. How to do what?

Mr. KORNFEDER. I mean, how to combine theology with the concepts of materialism and how to propagate it and agitate it and organize it, and so on.

Mr. KUNZIG. You have mentioned Dr. Harry F. Ward. Were any clergymen discussed at the Lenin Institute while you attended it?

Mr. KORNFEDER. No; no. The first time this object came up about Harry F. Ward was in the Anglo-American Secretariat.

Mr. SCHERER. When was that?

Mr. KORNFEDER. That was in 1929.

Mr. SCHERER. Was that in Moscow?

Mr. KORNFEDER. In Moscow, at Communist International headquarters, where the then head of the Anglo-American Secretariat was a fellow by the name of Gallagher, a Britisher, who went into the party under the name of Bell in Moscow. Every foreign Communist operated in Moscow under a party name. A party name usually was different from the one he used in his own country.

Gallagher used the name of Bell, and one of the reports that he had upon the United States mentioned Harry F. Ward, whom, of course, I knew from before. That is why the thing remains sufficiently in my mind, and he pointed out that the methods developed by Ward and the organization he is leading—much should be learned from those methods from the point of view of the practical approach of working inside the churches, not only in the United States, but in the other countries represented in the Anglo-American Secretariat.

He was, as it were, pictured as the architect of these methods.

Mr. SCHERER. When you speak of methods, methods for accomplishing what?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Of working inside the churches.

Mr. SCHERER. To promote what?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Of Communists and fellow travelers working inside the churches, giving themselves the coloring of religious reformers and of getting the church in the social side, away from spiritualism into the class struggle.

Mr. SCHERER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SCHERER. What was the final objective of the promotion of this type of activity within the American church?

Mr. KORNFEDER. The final objective is by these methods to soften up the minds of the churchgoers for the atheistic approach. That is, you get them to accept materialism as an essential feature of church activity. If you succeed, they then become, as it were, half conditioned to accept the rest of the materialistic doctrine and to become atheists, but that—

Mr. SCHERER. To accept that at a later date?

Mr. KORNFEDER. That is right.

Mr. SCHERER. What would be the final objective, then? To accept the Communist program?

Mr. KORNFEDER. The final objective would be to eliminate religion completely and accept communism.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was the name of Harry F. Ward ever stressed at any other time during your sojourn in Moscow or your stay in Moscow?

Mr. KORNFEDER. I heard about him often. His name was one of the prominent ones, but I was not particularly interested in the activities in the religious field except as a general tactic taught to those that took the training. My assignment was not infiltration in religion, but since religion was an important obstruction to Communist operations, the tactics of how to combat it were taught, and it was to that extent that Harry F. Ward came to my attention, both at that time and after I returned to the United States.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you describe the circumstances under which his name was mentioned upon your return to the United States?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Well, I remember one particular one which sticks in my mind because it had to do with what I was doing, and that was when I was located in Ohio, in Cleveland, when I had considerable difficulty in getting big strategic plants there, Republic Steel, Fisher Body, automobiles, and other giant plants around there and Akron, Ohio—the rubber plants. Gerhart Eisler, who was then representing the Communist International—that was in 1933—and who was doing everything he could to get the party to concentrate on the strategic

industry areas, sat with me an entire week on tactics of how to get at industry, and he suggested among other things, "Why don't you use Harry Ward's preachers in the effort of organizing these plants into Communist-controlled labor unions?"

Harry F. Ward at that time was, I believe, the head of the American League Against War and Fascism in which there were involved quite a number of preachers. Of course, when he mentioned Ward I knew what he meant because I knew about Ward before that.

Mr. KUNZIG. When he said to use Harry F. Ward's preachers, did you understand what he meant? That is, there was no implication that these Harry F. Ward preachers were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. KORNFEDER. No; not necessarily. He meant the preachers that Harry Ward could influence and who were collaborating in various other ways with the Communist Party and in some of the Communist Party fronts at that time, who may or may not have been secret party members.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did he name any of those other preachers? I know it is a long time ago.

Mr. KORNFEDER. Gerhart Eisler did not. I do not think I ever got around to using the idea.

Mr. KUNZIG. When you say you do not think you ever got around to using the idea, you mean actually that you never followed the suggestion?

Mr. KORNFEDER. That is right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, in the United States have you noticed any other examples of the application of Communist tactics within any religious organization within the United States?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Yes. There is a group called the People's Institute of Applied Religion, headed by Rev. Claude Williams. That is a somewhat different type of a setup from the Methodist Federation for Social Action. That is, it does not concentrate upon one denomination like the Methodist Federation for Social Action does. It operates upon an area, in this case, particularly the Southern States.

The Communists found it very difficult to get at the South, both at the Negroes or the hillbillies, and they, of course, were wrestling with that for a long time to find an approach on how to operate in the South, and this approach of getting through such a religious-looking front as the People's Institute of Applied Religion, at the churches in the South, was a way of doing it.

Now, to say how successful they were with it would require exploring to get their activities in detail, but I know the setup has been in operation already for a number of years and involves both Negro and white preachers. Negro preachers down there are very poor, and so they thought they could easily work on them. For that matter, the white preachers, these hillbilly churches, they are not rich, either. They would sort of consider it the proletarian part of the church. The South has mystified the party leadership for a long time, because according to their theory it should be an easy mark for Communist operations. Yet it has been found to be rather difficult. These people seem to apply the religion—this is one of the approaches they developed in the last 8 years or so.

Mr. KUNZIG. Where is the People's Institute of Applied Religion located?

Mr. KORNFEDER. It is one of the Southern States. I do not recall the exact location. I think it is Alabama.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was the People's Institute of Applied Religion located in Detroit, Mich., at one time?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Rev. Claude Williams was, and he spoke there in the name of the People's Institute of Applied Religion. Whether this was the national headquarters at the time, I do not know for certain, but it may have been because ever since the People's Institute went into business, the head of it was always Claude Williams, so it may have been the temporary headquarters for the People's Institute of Applied Religion before he moved down to the South, you see.

Mr. SCHERER. Is Claude Williams a minister?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Of what denomination?

Mr. KORNFEDER. I believe he is a Baptist, or a Presbyterian.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you know whether he is in good standing with the church today?

Mr. KORNFEDER. No, I do not. They work in all denominations, the People's Institute of Applied Religion, but on an area basis which takes in Baptists, Presbyterians, Seventh Day Adventists, and all denominations that they can get at.

Mr. KUNZIG. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you have any information regarding whether or not Claude Williams is a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Well, I am myself certain that he was a member of the party by the nature of his activities. Whether I ever met him in the party I do not recall.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know of any other persons associated with any religious denomination whatsoever who were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Well, there were some preachers in Ohio who were involved in the movement, but I just do not recall the names. Maybe if I would come across the names it would refresh my memory, but I just do not recall them. Of course, I remember the former bishop, William Montgomery Brown, Episcopal bishop. I know about him, that he was a party member, but he never denied it. He, himself, admitted that he was, took pride in calling himself a Bolshevik. He switched over to a complete atheist position. He wrote a book banishing the gods from the skies and the capitalist from the earth.

Mr. SCHERER. The fact is that there are somewhere a few ministers who are actually members of the party; is that not right?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Yes, I am sure that the party base among the ministers is rather narrow.

Mr. SCHERER. What do you know about the membership of ministers in Communist-front organizations?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Oh, there you really find them in tremendous numbers. You have, for instance, such a spectacle as more than 2,000 signing a petition, Communist-sponsored petition in behalf of the Rosenbergs in a situation where everybody knew what was involved.

Mr. SCHERER. Tell us for the record what was involved.

Mr. KORNFEDER. Well, there was involved here two individuals being convicted of being engaged in an espionage matter of utmost conse-

quence to the United States, and everybody in the United States knew it that could read and still, according to the Daily Worker, there are 2,300 preachers who signed that petition for the Rosenbergs. Those I would call——

Mr. SCHERER. Who instigated the petition for the Rosenbergs?

Mr. KORNFEDER. That committee they had, Committee to Defend the Rosenbergs.

Mr. SCHERER. Was that a Communist-dominated committee?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Oh, it certainly was. That was the Communist-created committee and Communist-dominated committee, and those who signed that petition under such circumstances would be—that is, as far as preachers are concerned—would be the party members or fellow travelers who were close enough to put their names down in spite of all the issues involved.

I am certain that you could not find 2 dozen among those 2,300 who would sign a petition for spies of any other power than Russia.

Mr. SCHERER. So, among these 2,000 ministers were, however, some just idealists and pacifists, were there not?

Mr. KORNFEDER. I do not think so. I think that those 2,000 were pretty close to the machine. Of course they may have been. It is always possible to have a few stray ones.

Mr. SCHERER. Were there not some ministers to whom this petition was misrepresented? Do you know?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Oh, I have no doubt that was misrepresented to them, but in face of the public commotion on the subject that any minister could find out for himself what was involved here, irrespective of what the solicitors and circulators of the petitions told them, when they signed, they knew what they were signing.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, it is still possible that there were a few of them who foolishly signed the petition on the representations made by the solicitors, which were false representations?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Oh, even in the strangest thing there are always a few stray ones, but I think the obvious characteristic is that the great majority who signed that petition under those circumstances knew exactly what they were doing.

Mr. SCHERER. Could you tell us something more of the association in Communist-front organizations by members of the clergy, and when I say Communist-front organizations, I mean those organizations that have been designated by this committee or the Attorney General as subversive?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Well, you will find the preachers who are fellow travelers or sympathizers as a rule on three types of fronts. One type propagandizes in favor of Soviet foreign policy, be it in reference to China or whatever other aspect of Soviet foreign policy is concerned. That is one bloc of preachers, and they are very numerous.

Another type of a front on which they have their whole lineup of preachers would be to defend the Communist fronts like the Civil Rights Congress, American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, so-called, and as I cited before, the Rosenberg Committee, which was a definite Communist front. They would line up their whole array of party and fellow-traveling preachers and they would be preachers who they would utilize for their youth fronts.

Mr. SCHERER. When you say preachers, they are not confined to any one particular denomination or sect, are they, who belong to these Communist-front organizations?

Mr. KORNFEDER. No; they include various denominations in the Protestant faith and many in the Jewish and often—or rather, rarely some Catholic preachers. You see, their infiltration in the Catholic Church is mainly among the laymen. They had some experiences trying to line up the Catholic priests, and, well, something usually happened pretty quickly, so they learned to concentrate in infiltration on Catholic among the laymen. It is a somewhat different field or method of approach, but they want to get at religion, whoever it is and wherever it is, whether it is Protestant, Jewish, Catholic, or Moslem, any faith it happens to be. Of course, thus far among most of their known infiltration organizations they are among the Protestants. Among the Jews they also use different methods.

Mr. SCHERER. Would you not say, however, that many of these ministers who have alined themselves with Communist-front organizations have done so unwittingly?

Mr. KORNFEDER. No—well, some have, of course. There is always a sucker list involved in this—I mean, preachers on 1 or 2 fronts, thinking that—

Mr. SCHERER. When I say unwittingly, I mean that they have no intention of joining with any group that would eventually destroy religion as the Communists plan to do?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Yes; I agree with you that most of those who even fellow-traveled with them to various fronts do not understand that they are led by atheists, you see.

Mr. SCHERER. That is what I mean. I mean, they do not understand fully that it is a part of the Communist program to eventually destroy religion, is that not right?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Yes, and I agree with you that most of them do not. But when I say most of them, I do not include in that the fellow-traveling category, although even among those there may be some who do not understand it. You see, I put them in three categories, really, the preachers.

Mr. SCHERER. I would like to hear what categories you put them in.

Mr. KORNFEDER. I put them in the category of, first, the secret party members. Those, I believe, will not exceed 600 among the thousands that they inveigled into the various operations.

Mr. SCHERER. You mean there are not more than 600 members of the clergy throughout the United States who are party members?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Yes; that is my estimate on the basis of the knowledge I have in this field. It may be an underestimation, but I am convinced that their party base is rather narrow in this operation. Among those I would include clergymen who followed the party through several zigzags, flip-flops of party policy, who did not quit when the party, for instance, changed from being anti-Fascist to being allied with the Fascists. That requires such a somersault mentally that only a party member would go along with the somersault. That would be one category.

The second category I would take is the fellow travellers who, let us say, are members of one of their infiltration organizations like the Methodist Federation for Social Action or the People's Institute of

Applied Religion, and who at the same time are on 4 or more fronts outside the religious field.

Mr. SCHERER. When you say fronts, you mean front organizations that are or have been declared subversive?

Mr. KORNFEDER. That is right.

Mr. SCHERER. All right.

Mr. KORNFEDER. Then the others are among the fellow-travelling category, and I would estimate there are probably three or four thousand. Others I would just put in the category of sympathizers who temporarily go along with one or another front for a period of time and then fade out. Well, among those, of course, I do not know, but there is a tremendous number of those who just get caught up in one or another movement. About these temporary sympathizers I would not worry. If there is any serious effort made to expose these movements, the temporary sympathizers will fade out.

Mr. SCHERER. You mean expose the Communist program for infiltration into the religion?

Mr. KORNFEDER. That is right. As a matter of fact, they probably will lose, even among the fellow travelers, some of which will just fade away because they would consider it from all points of view as dangerous, but I do not include in that number people who have been on several fronts and who sign a thing like this Rosenberg petition. They are, as it were, the hard core of this machinery inside of religion.

If I may make a synthesis of the whole thing, anybody who will work with the Communists to convert religionists in the direction of communism with a 10 percent, 20 percent or 80 percent—the Communists will work with them, but it is a one-way proposition. Anybody, on the other hand, who will be active to try to make religionists out of them, they will fight, slander them, and if they happen to be behind the Iron Curtain, they will eliminate them physically. That is, they will work with you whether it is a 10 percent, 20 or 30, if you aim to bring those who believe in religion toward communism, toward the Communist point of view, but anyone that will try to do anything to the contrary, to defend religion and to convert Communists into believers, those they will fight tooth and nail in every way.

If you measure their whole program in this field on that basis, you will have a good yardstick for every possible occasion.

Mr. SCHERER. Many of the intellectuals and clergy who have found their way into the Communist-front movements have done so because they have become dissatisfied with our American system, particularly our American economic system, do you not find that true?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Oh, yes; that plays a role all the time. As a matter of fact, the idea that individuals become Communists just because of economic reasons is fallacious. If misery was the inducement to communism, all these Asiatic countries and those of the Near East would all have been Communist a long time ago. Instead, you have communism thriving in your more advanced countries.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, we have been talking about intellectuals, which includes, of course, the clergy.

I am just wondering if it is not a fact that some of our intellectuals and some of our clergy who have an exceptionally good educational background are not a little dissatisfied with a system that pays them

maybe a maximum of \$5,000 a year, and the corner grocer, who has not had even a high-school education, gets maybe \$15,000 a year.

Mr. KORNFEDER. Well, I would say they would retain the same point of view even if you pay them \$8,000 a year.

Mr. SCHERER. Would that viewpoint not change a little bit if they were paid \$25,000 a year?

Mr. KORNFEDER. It could be with some of them that it may. It may with some of them, yes, but the economic consideration, I think, is subsidiary to the influence of propaganda and agitation. You find that not only in the clergy, but in the field as a whole.

For instance, according to the theory that if you solve the economic problems or help to solve them, you solve the Communist question—

Mr. SCHERER. What do these intellectuals and ministers look for which causes them to change and adopt the program as sponsored by the Communist Party as you have described it here today?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Well, it is a mixture of motives, one of which is probably based on religion, which is that—well, the Communists in their propaganda, at least, have the concept of social reformers, of advocating brotherhood of man and abolition of poverty and all these things, the original notions of which were contained in the religion itself, and, well, the Communist propaganda reminds them constantly that on the present society all of these problems have been solved, so that is one approach they have.

Mr. SCHERER. On the surface the Communist philosophy in itself is an attractive philosophy, particularly to a minister; is that not true?

Mr. KORNFEDER. It has its attractions, yes.

Mr. SCHERER. I say on the surface it appears—

Mr. KORNFEDER. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. It would have to be an attractive philosophy to attract people to the Communist cause, would it not?

Mr. KORNFEDER. That is right.

Mr. SCHERER. And it is used, is it not, for that purpose?

Mr. KORNFEDER. It is.

Mr. SCHERER. This seemingly attractive philosophy, to attract the masses to its cause.

Mr. KORNFEDER. They seldom deliver a package of goods in order to use it for their purposes, yes.

Mr. SCHERER. It is 1 o'clock. Are there any other questions that you have of Mr. Kornfeder?

Mr. KUNZIG. I have one.

Mr. Kornfeder, you testified briefly regarding your knowledge of what the Communists did to religious groups and religious denominations while you were present at Moscow attending the Lenin School. You have also testified as to the tactics applied in Moscow to destroy the church from the outside and from the inside. You have also testified that in the United States two organizations, the Methodist Federation for Social Action and the People's Institute of Applied Religion practice the tactics which you acquired knowledge of in Moscow in order to destroy religion in the United States. You have also testified that you have personal knowledge of the value of the Reverend Harry F. Ward in the Communist attempt to infiltrate religion in the United States.

I think that is all I have.

Mr. SCHERER. Does the name Harry F. Ward and other early leaders in the antireligious movement as related to the Communist program appear in the social action movements of the various denominations in the United States?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Yes, it does; it also appears—Harry Ward's name also appears in some of the speeches in a laudatory manner of Earl Browder.

He is on the staff of the Protestant, which is a monthly—used to be a monthly—originally the Protestant Digest, which is, as it were, a pace setter for their methods of operation in the church field. He is on the staff of the Protestant. He is on the directing committee of the People's Institute of Applied Religion. He is a leader in the Methodist Federation for Social Action. That was already explained.

I think he is also, if I recollect correctly, on the activities of a similar group in the Episcopal Church. He, of course, is on any number of this type of front that I explained. He is, really, and the stuff he writes indicates that he is, the theoretical and political leader of this method of operation.

Mr. SCHERER. In this country?

Mr. KORNFEDER. In this country, yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Before we close, is it not a fact, Mr. Kornfeder, that the vast majority of the clergy from all denominations have not been influenced by the propaganda which you have described to us today?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Oh, yes, I agree with you that the vast majority—

Mr. SCHERER. Actually, there is only a small percentage of the clergy from all denominations who are either members of the party itself or members of the Communist-front organizations?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Yes; I agree with you that the vast majority are loyal to the United States and to religion, but when you have a compact group that is capable of mobility and is led by people who are experienced in the arts of political warfare—and this is a part of the art of political warfare: this infiltration—then the others who are loyal and who are individuals, individualists, when they get ganged up by a ramified machine like that, well, the impression is created that of course they are the big factor and the other ones are only hiding out somewhere. That is the advantage of this type of organization.

Mr. SCHERER. Even some of those who are members of the front organizations are in their own mind, at least, loyal American citizens, are they not?

Mr. KORNFEDER. Well, I would say the sympathizers who just go along with 1 or 2 or even 3 fronts, they are in their minds loyal to the United States. Those are a large number, of course, but I would not include the others: the fellow travelers and the secret party members.

Mr. SCHERER. I think that is all.

We want to thank you for your testimony, Mr. Kornfeder. We appreciate it.

The committee will recess for about an hour and 15 minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1:07 p. m., the hearing recessed to 2:30 p. m. of the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

EXECUTIVE SESSION ¹

(The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities reconvened at 2 p. m., in room 1305, Federal Building, New York City, the Honorable Kit Clardy (acting chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Kit Clardy, and Francis E. Walter.

Staff members present: Robert L. Kunzig, counsel; Courtney E. Owens, investigator; Juliette Joray, acting clerk; and Dolores Anderson, reporter.)

TESTIMONY OF VLADIMIR PETROV

Mr. CLARDY. Let the record show that I have been appointed as acting chairman, by Chairman Harold H. Velde, for the purposes of this hearing.

Let the record also show that a subcommittee, consisting of Representative Walter and myself, has been appointed for the purposes of this hearing, and that all are present.

Will the witness stand and be sworn, please?

In the testimony you are about to give, do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. PETROV. I do.

Mr. CLARDY. Are you ready to question the witness, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am.

Would you state your name, please, and spell it for the record?

Mr. PETROV. My first name is V-l-a-d-i-m-i-r, and my last name is P-e-t-r-o-v.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is your present address, Mr. Petrov?

Mr. PETROV. My address is Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you on the faculty there?

Mr. PETROV. Yes.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Petrov, are you not represented by counsel? Under the rules of this committee, you could have counsel if you so desire.

Mr. PETROV. No, thank you, sir. I have had to be my own counsel all my life.

Mr. CLARDY. We will do our best to protect your interests, sir, since you do not have counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Petrov, where were you born?

Mr. PETROV. In Odessa, Russia.

Mr. KUNZIG. What date were you born, please?

Mr. PETROV. November 15, 1915.

Mr. KUNZIG. How long have you been in this country?

Mr. PETROV. Since April 28, 1947.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you a naturalized citizen?

Mr. PETROV. Yes, I am.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Petrov, it is my understanding that you, some time in your life, spent a considerable period of years in a concentration camp within the borders of the U. S. S. R.; is that correct?

¹ Released by the full committee.

Mr. PETROV. That is right, for 6 years.

Mr. KUNZIG. What years were you there, sir?

Mr. PETROV. From 1935 to 1941.

Mr. KUNZIG. During the time you were in the concentration camp for these 6 years, did you have any occasion to note how the Government of the U. S. S. R. treated the clergy in that country?

Mr. PETROV. Yes, there were several occasions. I knew several persons who were in the camp and who were ex-clergymen, or they continued to be clergymen. Of course they were prisoners at the time I met them.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you describe to the committee the details of the treatment of these clergymen?

Mr. PETROV. They didn't represent any separate group within the camp where I was. They were among the so-called political prisoners, mixed with them. We had several groups of political prisoners who got different treatment.

Mr. KUNZIG. What kind of treatment was given to the clergy, better or worse?

Mr. PETROV. It was worse among the clergy.

Mr. KUNZIG. What sort of treatment did they get?

Mr. PETROV. They could get nothing but menial work. They were given less to eat, and were for the most part aged people, but they were never allowed to do any office work. Although some other persons once in a while could get that chance, they were forbidden to get any such work. On several occasions they were forced, not to live among the more or less intelligentsia, but instead to live with the hardened criminals, like thieves, bandits, and so on.

Mr. KUNZIG. What was the crime for which these clergymen were in the concentration camp?

Mr. PETROV. I remember one occasion very well, because that man was my neighbor in a tent where we lived. He was put in prison because he conducted illegally the baptizing of little children in the city where he lived, without being a priest anymore. He worked in a factory in Leningrad, as an ordinary worker.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was he an ordained Catholic?

Mr. PETROV. No, Russian Orthodox.

Mr. KUNZIG. In order to make the matter clear, the Government had forbidden him to be a priest?

Mr. PETROV. He was expelled from the city where he lived and he was deprived of civil rights by the Government and couldn't work excepting in a factory or farm.

Mr. KUNZIG. But because of his beliefs, he continued baptizing the children?

Mr. PETROV. Yes, because he said it was not like taking a job for a while, but for life. His fellow-workers knew about it, so some of them who were old-fashioned used to call him and he would baptize newly born children for them.

Mr. KUNZIG. And he was thrown into the concentration camp for this?

Mr. PETROV. Yes; he got no trial.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you say the prisoners who were in the concentration camp then were there for noncriminal reasons, as we know it in this country, but merely for being priests? Would that be a true statement?

Mr. PETROV. I would say that was a fair statement.

Mr. KUNZIG. Where was the camp in which you were incarcerated?

Mr. PETROV. This was in the Russian counterpart of Alaska—across the Bering Strait.

Mr. KUNZIG. It was actually in Siberia then?

Mr. PETROV. Yes; the northwestern part of it.

Mr. KUNZIG. The climate there was very rigorous, was it not?

Mr. PETROV. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. You say this type of prisoner got special treatment, worse than that other prisoners got?

Mr. PETROV. I would say much worse than average. I had a chance, for instance, once in a while to do some supervisory work and not to overstrain myself, but the traitors, spies, and former priests were treated in a rather harsh way in the camp.

Mr. KUNZIG. As you said before, the only reason for the treatment of the priests in that fashion was that they were priests?

Mr. PETROV. Yes; and the administration of the camp was composed of people who didn't believe in anything.

Mr. KUNZIG. Or any religion?

Mr. PETROV. Yes; in any religion.

Mr. KUNZIG. They despised priests?

Mr. PETROV. Yes; and they encouraged the criminals, the bandits, for instance, to mistreat these priests within the camp.

Mr. KUNZIG. You mean by methods of torture?

Mr. PETROV. Yes; they were allowed to do that.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Petrov, if it lies within your knowledge, is that the general way in which the clergy were treated under the Communist regime in Russia?

Mr. PETROV. It is rather hard to generalize. Some of the clergy found ways of cooperating with the Government and among the people those who cooperated with the Government weren't respected because this cooperation sometimes went too far, more than it was considered proper for a priest. Generally speaking, however, the fact that the priests were deprived of civil rights, even though they weren't put into prison, their lives were made rather difficult in the country.

Mr. KUNZIG. There are hardly any civil rights there now, as far as we can see.

Mr. PETROV. Well, still, if you are by law deprived of your civil rights, it is not only the fact you can't vote. You can't be a member of the union and can't get a decent job anywhere. It means also that you can't live in most of the big cities. You are confined to smaller communities and farms. You are usually banished from your own home and you have to live somewhere else. So, in practical terms, even in the Soviet Union, somebody who loses his civil rights is in a rather difficult situation.

Mr. KUNZIG. Then as I understand your testimony, in the Soviet Union, the priests and religious leaders, or clergy, are treated among the absolute worst of any of the population?

Mr. PETROV. Yes, I would say so. Alongside with those who belonged before the revolution to the privileged groups of society, like capitalists, nobility, and so forth, the priests were treated as enemies of the people.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you say that is because the Russian Government wanted to do away with religion and all it stands for?

Mr. PETROV. Yes, the Russian Church represented a different school of thought as compared with the Communist Party. In Russia the leadership was supposed to have a monopoly on ideas and any differences are not tolerated by the Government. During the war, so far as I know, there were few changes in that field.

Mr. KUNZIG. Could a priest get a ration card?

Mr. PETROV. No. Not unless he was working in a factory.

Mr. KUNZIG. That was the way they used to starve them?

Mr. PETROV. Yes, that is right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you have any personal knowledge of any incident in your own family that would show the brutal way in which the priests were treated?

Mr. PETROV. Yes, it was among my earliest recollections. I didn't witness it myself but it happened within my family. One of my uncles was a priest in the nearby village, near the city where I lived in the late part of 1922. It was then when the church within this village was closed down and the local Soviet officer decided to turn it into a stable for the local cavalry regiment which was stationed nearby. My uncle was rather stubborn and an old man and he protested without any success, and then when they came and were about to do what the Soviet had decided to do, he just wouldn't let them in.

Mr. KUNZIG. You mean into the church?

Mr. PETROV. Yes, into the church. They had already torn down the cross from the belfry, but he wouldn't let them into the church. There were a couple of Communists who were later reported to be somewhat drunk. They just shot him in front of the church, with his son and daughter.

Mr. KUNZIG. You mean they murdered him, along with his son and daughter?

Mr. PETROV. Yes. One was 14 years old and the other 12.

Mr. KUNZIG. What were the names of the children?

Mr. PETROV. Dimitri was the son, and Katherine was the daughter.

Mr. KUNZIG. So all three members of the family were murdered in cold blood?

Mr. PETROV. Yes. His wife survived, and my cousin.

Mr. KUNZIG. And it was well known that he was a priest?

Mr. PETROV. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. So, in order to make the record, as I understand you, a Russian priest in the Russian Orthodox Church may be married and have children?

Mr. PETROV. Yes; a priest can be married once, and have children, but not more than once.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did this shooting take place in private in any way, or was there a crowd of people around at that time?

Mr. PETROV. Oh, yes; there was a big crowd, because they wanted to make it a propaganda place—turn the church into a stable so that they gathered practically everyone in the village around to witness the turning of the church into a stable.

Mr. KUNZIG. In order to show them how the Communist regime was able to take houses of worship and change them to stables and thereby fight religion?

Mr. PETROV. Yes; and they couldn't afford to lose face apparently, before the people.

Mr. KUNZIG. You mean that since your elderly uncle had stood in the doorway and defied them, they didn't dare lose face, so they just shot him?

Mr. PETROV. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was this uncle's wife living at this time?

Mr. PETROV. Well, she wasn't there at that time. She was at home in the same village. She didn't see it happen.

Mr. KUNZIG. What happened to her?

Mr. PETROV. When she learned about it, she was so shocked that she could never recover her mentality. She remained an unbalanced person for the rest of her life. In the first place, they didn't want to permit her to get the corpses of her husband and children, but then they arranged it somewhat and they were taken away in the night and buried someplace—not in the cemetery. They were supposed to be buried near the bank of the river, under some tree there. There were just a few friends from the population of that village who came to the funeral. The Cossacks then let her go to the city where the rest of her family lived. She was my mother's sister.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did the priest's wife later die?

Mr. PETROV. She died 4 or 5 years later, but as I say, she remained mentally unbalanced during that time.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is there any other incident which you can tell the committee about?

Mr. PETROV. That reminds me of another incident which I would like to tell if I may, with regard to the way the clergy was considered in the Soviet Union?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, please do. Proceed.

Mr. PETROV. When another sister of my mother's died—it was in 1929, I believe—since the family was pretty religious, they decided to have a regular funeral in the church. In all the city there was just one church open at that time with a cemetery. The rest of them were closed and my mother went to that funeral. Somebody saw her and since she was a school teacher, somebody in the crowd saw her who knew her and reported her presence in the church to the principal of the school where she worked. Next day she was invited to the office of the director, and she was told that if she ever did that again she would lose her job, and so she was forbidden to repeat the offense. Being a teacher, she could not be allowed to show such a bad example to the children, and to other citizens of the city.

Mr. KUNZIG. You mean set such a bad example as to go to a religious funeral?

Mr. PETROV. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. In other words, you are suggesting that a teacher should have nothing to do with religion?

Mr. PETROV. Yes; if they did, they couldn't keep their jobs teaching in school.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is there anything else you can tell us about?

Mr. PETROV. Yes. I can remember when I was in the concentration camp, there were lots of times when we worked in the woods, chopping firewood. There was this one time, especially, when it was rather cold and we had to build fires and stop to get warm every so often. In our

particular work gang there was one old man, an ex-priest, and ex-monk, but he still considered himself a clergyman. Among his fellow priests there was one who was a very old man, I would say he was at least 80 years old, and he was sentenced to 15 or 20 years of prison. He never mentioned why he was sentenced to prison and worked to the best of his ability. When someone died he never missed an occasion to perform some very simple ceremony over the body. As a rule, all of those who died in the camp were just thrown into a big grave, but if this man saw somebody die, he felt it his duty to help a dying man to pass away and would always make it a point to pray a little over the body.

Once, when we were in the woods, another man who was pretty sick for a couple of weeks or more before that, died there in the woods. We had pretty bad guards at that time, and when it was time to go, it was only then that we discovered this old fellow had died. We were ordered to leave him where he was and the rest of us had to go back to the camp, or barracks. This old fellow, the former priest, refused to go. He said his duty was to stay there, and the guards, after some deliberation, decided to let him stay. So they left him in the forest and we were ordered back to the barracks.

When we came back the next morning, this old former priest was frozen. He had tried to get to the camp, but the snow was deep and he probably lost his way. I don't know just what happened for sure, but he died there.

Mr. KUNZIG. In other words, they wouldn't even allow the priest to say a few words over the body and come back into the camp?

Mr. PETROV. Well, they tried to laugh it off in the first place, and said "What was the use—if somebody is dead, he is dead," but they could have at least left him a bonfire. We usually had one on an occasion like that because it was 55 and 60 below zero, and once in a while we could go and get warm. When the priest asked to stay, the guards said, "All right, you may stay," but they put out the bonfire so if he stayed he couldn't warm himself.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Petrov, do you feel these sort of tactics through these past years have succeeded in exterminating religion from Russia, or do you feel there is still a strong religious feeling among the people?

Mr. PETROV. I would say in the countryside, among the peasants, the religious feeling has remained strong practically all the time. The younger generation that moved to the cities lost a great deal of connection with the church and religion, because there were no churches to keep the feeling alive.

Mr. KUNZIG. There were no churches?

Mr. PETROV. There was still something which could be called a substitute, which was the family tradition, and was very strong in Russia. The churches could remain closed, but the influence within the family, if in that family certain traditions were preserved, was a very strong one. The children who lost their parents, or who went their own way, have departed, of course, a great deal from knowing anything about religion. It was rather peculiar to learn, however, that during the last war so many young people turned back to religion. Some friends of mine who were in Moscow during the years of the war said some churches were opened. It was a part

of the general campaign of the Soviet Government to win the support of the people.

Mr. KUNZIG. You mean the churches were reopened?

Mr. PETROV. Yes. Thirty-five were reopened. Those who went at all to churches saw very many young people, including young soldiers and young officers there during the war. It was quite understandable, I think, because the whole atmosphere of insecurity made everyone feel they didn't know what was going to happen the next day.

Mr. KUNZIG. So, in other words, try as hard as they may, the Communists and their vicious masters of Russia have not succeeded in completely exterminating religion?

Mr. PETROV. No; they have not.

Mr. KUNZIG. But it is certainly safe to say they are trying their hardest to do so?

Mr. PETROV. They are doing their best to do this; yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Even today?

Mr. PETROV. Yes; even today.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have no further questions to ask the witness, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WALTER. I have no questions.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, I don't recall precisely when it was you came to this country.

Mr. PETROV. It was in 1947.

Mr. CLARDY. With your background of actual experience in Russia, and with 6 years or so of experience in this country, I wonder if you are not equipped to give us a quick summary by way of a comparison of how we treat religion in this country, as compared to how they treat it in Russia?

Mr. PETROV. Well, I don't know exactly how to say it about the way you treat religion in this country. Various churches exist and coexist with each other here without being troubled, and have nobody in the Government who interferes with their religious activities. They are free to do whatever they want in every denomination, the Protestants, Roman Catholics, and others.

Mr. CLARDY. To phrase it more directly, you have lived under an oppressive dictatorship, and now you are living in a free country. Would you say the words "religious freedom" really have meaning here?

Mr. PETROV. Yes; I feel they do, and I must say, this is the first country—and I was in about a dozen of them before I came here, including my native Russia—where I may really feel at home.

Mr. CLARDY. You mean you feel secure?

Mr. PETROV. Yes. I feel at home here. Even if I am not a first-class citizen.

Mr. CLARDY. May I interrupt you to say, sir, that all of us in this country are, in effect, naturalized citizens in one way or another. You are just as much a citizen as I am, sir, and you are regarded by your fellowman exactly the same way as I am.

Mr. PETROV. I know that.

Mr. CLARDY. In fact, you have one up on me. You have a means of proving your American citizenship, and I have nothing to show for it but my word.

Mr. PETROV. Haven't you a birth certificate?

Mr. CLARDY. At the time I was born, they didn't issue birth certificates, and I had to have something made up as a substitute for it. They didn't record it officially when I was a youngster.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Petrov, wherein is a naturalized citizen not a first-class citizen?

Mr. PETROV. Well, I had ambitions for many years to enter foreign service, for instance, and under the law I can't become a member of the Foreign Service in the United States until I stay here 15 years after naturalization.

Mr. WALTER. Do you think that much of a handicap?

Mr. PETROV. Oh, no.

Mr. WALTER. Do you think it is much of a handicap for a naturalized citizen for this country to require that he refrain from joining a Communist organization after he is naturalized?

Mr. PETROV. No; I don't think this is really important whether you are naturalized or not, but I meant some people here are rather snobbish, not necessarily in the Government, who consider people like me who came here and were born abroad as not quite American. I don't blame them, and don't feel hard toward them on account of it.

Mr. WALTER. I don't blame them any more than I blame the Russians abroad who feel that way toward the Americans, some of whom I have met. Do you feel that because you were naturalized as a citizen in the United States, that you are under any handicap because you were not born in the United States?

Mr. PETROV. No; I don't feel that way. I say I feel at home here more than I have ever in my life felt at home anywhere, and as much as my son, who was born here.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Petrov, there are at least two branches of the Russian Church here in America; are there not?

Mr. PETROV. Yes; that's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are they pro-American, and anti-Communist?

Mr. PETROV. No; there are three jurisdictions, as they call themselves, of the Russian Orthodox Church in the United States. One is directed, or directly under the command of the patriarch in Moscow. This may be safely called pro-Soviet in this country. They have hardly more than 6 or 8 parishes all over the country and their headquarters are here in New York City. They have no influence at all, practically.

Mr. KUNZIG. What do you mean by pro-Soviet?

Mr. PETROV. Well, they carry out the plan of the present leadership of the Russian Church in Moscow, which says that the church has never been persecuted in Russia and that there is complete freedom of religion there.

Mr. KUNZIG. Which, of course, is a lie?

Mr. PETROV. Yes, this is a lie, and they are telling that lie here.

Mr. KUNZIG. So that there are some of the Russian Orthodox churches here who are very closely allied with the church in Moscow, Russia, and hew to the political philosophy there espoused?

Mr. PETROV. Yes. Yes. Many directives that they send out do not present the complete events in churches in the Soviet Union, but they instead have praise for Stalin and appeals to the people. They are praying now for the leadership of the Soviet Union and they report the typical lies that are told in Russia about the situation in religion there.

Mr. KUNZIG. For these churches that are pro-Soviet in this country, is there a small hierarchy machinery, or is there a large hierarchy machinery?

Mr. PETROV. The hierarchy machinery is too big for the number of people.

Mr. KUNZIG. The six churches do not usually have a bishop?

Mr. PETROV. They have what is called a metropolitan. It is like a Roman Catholic Church.

Mr. KUNZIG. Like a cardinal?

Mr. PETROV. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. They have 1 for 6 churches?

Mr. PETROV. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Six churches can't usually support all that. Where is their money coming from?

Mr. PETROV. I may guess that the mother church in the Soviet Union is helping them. I must say they get pretty decent treatment in this country. There was a long, long lawsuit about who was going to possess the largest cathedral here, the American Russian Church or this Moscow Russian Church. I believe it lasted for 5 or 6 years and went through various courts and eventually the Supreme Court decided in favor of the people of the Moscow patriarch. They got the cathedral.

Mr. KUNZIG. The other American church does not have this domination?

Mr. PETROV. No; it is entirely independent. It is politically 100 percent American. It is independent from Moscow entirely. They were close to Moscow during the years of war because there was considerable pressure on the part of the rank and file Russians here. I must say the greater part of the Russians here came here before the revolution, and to that extent during the war they were patriots—Soviet patriots. The general mood in this country was somewhat of wanting some sort of reconciliation.

Mr. KUNZIG. After the war they broke away again?

Mr. PETROV. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. There is only a small group they have any question about?

Mr. PETROV. Yes. They are just a small jurisdiction. The second one has about 100 churches in this country.

Mr. KUNZIG. How much does the third one have?

Mr. PETROV. Eighty or 85, as far as I can figure. This church appeared in the United States after the enactment of the Displaced Persons Act, when many former Soviet citizens came here. The third jurisdiction is rather militaristically anti-Communist. While the American church doesn't go deeply into political matters, this one does. There was some friction between them and the Russian church for a time, but I believe now it is considerably ironed out.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. I thank you, witness, but I believe I do want to ask another question or two. You have been here long enough to have observed many of our ways of life. Have you found any significant evidence, or for that matter, any evidence at all of any movement here to attack the church or religion, as such, and to destroy it?

Mr. PETROV. I never noticed any. There was some movement—you can actually hardly call it a movement—but there were certain groups

of citizens that were attacking the Catholic church. But they were groups of citizens who did not like Catholics, for one reason or another. I have read a couple of books written on the subject.

Mr. CLARDY. You have found no evidence of any concerted effort to do anything to harm religion or the church?

Mr. PETROV. No, I have never noticed it.

Mr. CLARDY. I asked you that question because you are an outsider, in one sense of the word. That is, you come in with a fresh viewpoint. You are not one who has been brought up and lived with our system, so your viewpoint is one the native American can't possibly get because he is part of the scene.

Mr. PETROV. If I may say so, in certain ways there seems to be a bit too much freedom. It seems that the people do not have a self-discipline which is needed in a society where everybody wants to feel free.

Mr. WALTER. I knew a United States Senator at one time who introduced a bill making it a crime to publish deliberately that which was not true, and during the following year he was defeated for the Senate.

Mr. CLARDY. May I say this is one of the main reasons why this Nation has lasted as long as it has? That is the fact that it does have such a broad tolerance that folks like yourself and even some of us here, I am sure, sometimes become a little impatient with the way our freedom is used. That is one of the secrets why our form of Government is a success.

Mr. PETROV. I would like to think so.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, we have an experiment here that is over 160 years old, as you know. That is young in the life of the Planner, but it is still a long time.

Mr. WALTER. The one thing the people forget is, the Founding Fathers were just as afraid of the democracy of the extreme left as the autocracy they got away from.

Mr. CLARDY. Yes.

Mr. PETROV. This one thing I would like to say, the intellectual power, so far as I can see in this country, has been concentrated in one particular group during these years of the last war, and maybe even before that, and this power is not counterbalanced by the people who, insofar as I can see, represent the majority and who have rather different views. They have different views, but very few raise their voices to express their views.

Mr. WALTER. Why?

Mr. PETROV. I don't know. It happened that way.

Mr. CLARDY. Perhaps you haven't yet discovered some of the reasons why we have managed to last as long as we have, but I think your apprehensions are a little misguided. I think the great mass of people have found a pretty effective way of making their wishes known. We have regular elections and you would be surprised how the people show pretty fair judgment.

Mr. WALTER. Where have you lived since you have been in the United States?

Mr. PETROV. In Connecticut, mainly.

Mr. WALTER. In a city?

Mr. PETROV. New Haven. I have traveled a great deal about the country, however, and I have done quite a lot of lecturing in this country.

MR. WALTER. Then you do know many States. I was afraid your viewpoint was brought about by what you see at hand. This is not America.

MR. PETROV. But no, I believe I have found what is America.

MR. CLARDY. You know, it has been said, there is America, and then there is New York City. That is not said in criticism, but it is unquestionably the fact that this great metropolis is not a fair cross section of all the peoples or localities. If you come out to Michigan, Illinois, or other Midwestern States where there is a lot of wide-open space, you will find that the old "cracker-barrel" kind of politics is still practiced, and the people argue pretty intelligently.

MR. PETROV. Yes, I have learned that. I never have crossed the Mississippi, but east of the Mississippi I have visited in many States. I use every occasion to learn by talking to people of all kinds.

MR. CLARDY. I live in Michigan, but you haven't seen the United States until you come out our way.

MR. PETROV. I hope to go there some day.

MR. CLARDY. You have made an important contribution to our committee's work, sir. I must express my feelings by saying your story has shocked me, and I think it will everyone who reads your testimony. It is an important contribution to let everyone see and understand what the Communist Party has done in Russia, and what they want to do here. I do thank you, sir.

(At this point, Representative Kit Clardy left the hearing room.)

(At the hour of 2:45 p. m. of the same day, the proceedings were continued; Representatives Gordon H. Scherer, Francis E. Walter, and Morgan M. Moulder (appearance noted in transcript) being present.)

MR. SCHERER. The subcommittee will be in order.

Will counsel call the witness.

MR. KUNZIG. Benjamin Gitlow.

MR. SCHERER. Will you stand and be sworn. Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give in this hearing shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

MR. GITLOW. I do.

MR. SCHERER. Mr. Counsel, you may proceed.

MR. KUNZIG. I note you are not represented by counsel. You understand, of course, that every witness before this committee has a privilege to have counsel. Do I understand that you intend and desire to testify without any legal advice?

MR. GITLOW. I do.

MR. KUNZIG. What is your name?

TESTIMONY OF BENJAMIN GITLOW

MR. GITLOW. Benjamin Gitlow, Paulding Lane, Crompond, N. Y.

MR. KUNZIG. I note, also, of course, that you have testified at a previous time before this committee, but in order to keep the record straight, if you wouldn't mind, sir, I would like to get your official background on the record at the beginning here.

Where were you born, sir?

MR. GITLOW. I was born in Elizabethport, N. J., on December 22, 1891.

Mr. KUNZIG. When did you join the Socialist Party?

Mr. GITLOW. I joined the Socialist Party in 1907.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you a member in any way of the executive committee of the People's Council formed to prevent the entry of the United States into World War I?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; I was a member of the executive committee of that organization.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you ever serve in any legislative body here in the United States?

Mr. GITLOW. I was a member of the New York State Legislature in the year of 1918.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know a John Reed and a Jim Larkin?

Mr. GITLOW. John Reed was a well-known American journalist and author and poet; and Jim Larkin was one of the outstanding leaders of the Irish labor movement. Both John Reed and Jim Larkin were instrumental, together with me, in the organization of the Communist Party of the United States.

Mr. KUNZIG. When was that, sir?

Mr. GITLOW. That was in 1919.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, Mr. Gitlow, in order to have all the facts complete on this record, it is correct, is it not, sir, that you were the first man in the United States convicted of being a Communist, and, after serving 3 years of a 5-to-10-year sentence at hard labor, Gov. Alfred E. Smith pardoned you?

Mr. GITLOW. That is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. I note also that while in prison you were elected honorary member of the Moscow Soviet; is that correct?

Mr. GITLOW. That is right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Will you give us any further information on your political career in the United States?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, I was always one of the top leading officials of the Communist Party in the United States from the year 1919 to 1929, when I had my fight with Joseph Stalin and left the Communist movement. Before that time I was a member of the Socialist Party. In the Communist Party I was the candidate for vice president in the presidential elections in 1924 and 1928.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you tell us any other official positions you held in the Communist Party?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes. I was a member of the political committee of the Communist Party; that is, the main, directing and policymaking committee of the organization. I was a member of its secretariat of three. That is a select committee that has tremendous powers in the Communist Party.

I was the general secretary of the Communist Party in 1929 before I was expelled from the Communist Party. I was head of the trade-union department of the Communist Party. I also was a candidate for mayor of New York City and for governor of the State of New York on the Communist Party ticket.

I headed the textile committee of the Communist Party that had to do with the unions that operated in the textile industry in the country. I also was head of the needle-trades committee of the Communist Party. That was the committee that had jurisdiction over the activities of the Communists in the needle-trades unions.

I was the representative of the Communist Party to a number of language bureaus of the Communist Party, and, in addition to that, many more activities.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you have anything to do at any time with the Communist International?

Mr. GITLOW. I was a member of the presidium of the Communist International. I was also a member of the executive committee of the Red Trade Union International. That was the trade organization of the Comintern.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you upon occasion visit the Soviet Union and meet with the leaders of communism there?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; I visited the Soviet Union in 1927, again in 1928, and also in 1929. On all these occasions I met with the top leaders of the Comintern and the heads of the Soviet Government.

In 1927, I had a long conference with Stalin. I met with Molotov; I met with Mannilsky; I met with Kuusinen; and I met with Piatnitsky and Bukharin; Tomskey, head of the Russian trade unions; Losovsky, chairman of the Red Trade Union International.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you meet Stalin also?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; I met Stalin on every occasion, and in 1927 at the headquarters of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party. I had in his private office a long conference with him.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you explain very briefly why you were expelled from the Communist Party in 1929?

Mr. GITLOW. I was expelled from the Communist Party in 1929 because I refused to accept the decision of Joseph Stalin on the American Communist Party. Joseph Stalin decided to shift the leadership of the American Communist Party. He ordered the party to depose the leadership which had the support of about 80 percent of the membership of the American Communist Party and to put in control in leadership the minority represented by William Z. Foster.

I went to Moscow as the head of a delegation from the American Communist Party to appeal against this decision by Joseph Stalin. In Moscow a committee was constituted consisting of the top leaders of the world Communist movement to consider our appeal. The chairman of that committee was Molotov, who is today 1 of the 3 top leaders of the Soviet Union and who is the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Government at the present time.

After being in Moscow for many weeks, Stalin handed down a decision in which he wanted those who appealed to admit that they were wrong, that they were crooked politicians, that they were agents of Herbert Hoover, who was then the President of the United States, that they were imperialists, et cetera.

I refused to sign that confession. I told Stalin when he spoke in favor of the decision that I was going back to the United States to fight against it, with the result that I was removed immediately from all my positions in the American Communist Party and in the Communist International and in the Profintern and was subsequently expelled from the Communist movement.

The Profintern is a contraction that stands for the international Red trade-union movement of the Comintern.

Mr. KUNZIG. In order to get this brief background complete, I think the record should also show that in 1939 Mr. Gitlow wrote I Confess, a

personal account of his own activities, including a history of the Communist Party and exposure of its operations.

In 1940, of course, as has already been stated here, prior to this record, Mr. Gitlow appeared before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities and made a thorough exposure of the Communist movement. His recent book, *The Whole of Their Lives*, deals with the psychological factors in communism and exposes the amoral basis of United States and world communism.

In conclusion I wish to place on the record the fact that in 1949 Mr. Gitlow went abroad on a special mission for the Hoover Institute and Library of Stanford University to gather material dealing with political and subversive movements. To carry out his mission he visited France, England, Belgium, Holland, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, Switzerland, Italy, and Israel.

Mr. WALTER. What was that date, please?

Mr. KUNZIG. 1949.

One final interesting comment: I think the record should show that Mr. Gitlow helped organize and stage the Mosinee pageant which on May 1, 1950, at Mosinee, Wis., demonstrated what would happen to the United States once the Communists took the country over, if ever that tragic happening should occur.

Now, Mr. Gitlow, the main purpose for which you have been invited to testify before this committee at this time is to give from your extensive background your experiences in connection with the relationship of the Communist Party to religion.

Would you in brief, please, trace the position of the Communist Party on the question of religion and its policies, if any, in the matter of Communist infiltration of religious institutions?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, I wish to state offhand that the basic position of the Communist Party—

Mr. KUNZIG. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. GITLOW. I believe that the basic atheistic position of world communism to religion has not changed from the inception of the Communist movement to date. The questions of the strategy and tactics which the Communists use for the purpose of exploiting the church, clergy, and the followers of the church for its own purposes are not in contradiction with the basic atheistic position and final goal of the destruction of the church as a superstitious institution in the service of capitalism and imperialism.

Mr. KUNZIG. Will you please elaborate on that, Mr. Gitlow?

Mr. GITLOW. I think a number of references should prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that the Communist movement is an atheistic movement.

In the fall of 1948 this is reported in the book, *The Vatican and the Kremlin*, by Camille Cianfarra. The following appeared in a pamphlet edited by the executive committee of the Konsomol, the youth organization of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, as "the 10 commandments of communism":

1. Never forget that the clergy is the most powerful enemy of the Communist estate.

2. Try to win your friends over to communism and remember that Stalin, who has given a new constitution to the Russian people, is the leader of the anti-God army, not only in the U. S. S. R. but throughout the world.

3. Convince your friends not to have any contact with priests.
4. Watch out for spies and report saboteurs to the police.
5. Make sure that atheist publications are distributed among the largest possible number of people.
6. A good young Communist must also be a militant atheist. He must know how to use his weapons and be experienced in the art of war.
7. Wherever you can you must fight religious elements and prevent whatever influence they might have on your comrades.
8. A true "godless" must also be a good police agent. It is the duty of all atheists to guard the security of the state.
9. Support the godless movement with your money, which is especially necessary for our propaganda abroad where funds, under present circumstances, can only be spent secretly.
10. If you are not a convinced atheist you cannot be a good Communist or a real Soviet citizen. Atheism is indissolubly bound to communism. These two ideals are the pillars of Soviet power.

Mr. WALTER. When was that published, did you say?

Mr. GITLOW. That was published around 1947 after the adoption of the Soviet Constitution.

Mr. SCHIERER. And from what publication?

Mr. GITLOW. This is taken from a book that was written by Cianfarra, who is the correspondent to the Vatican for the New York Times, and he wrote on the relations between the Vatican and the Kremlin, and he quotes from a pamphlet which was published by the Komsomol, the youth organization of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Mr. KUNZIG. That was the position of the Communist movement in 1948. What was the fundamental position of the Communists toward religion in 1919 and 1920 when the Communist Party of the United States was first organized?

Mr. GITLOW. It was identical. Permit me to quote from a pamphlet, *The Communist Program*, an analysis of the principles of the Russian Communist Party, by N. Bukharin, published in the United States in 1920 by the Contemporary Publishing Association, one of the early underground publishing organizations of the Communist Party.

On page 76 of chapter XVII, *Spiritual Liberation*—the next step to economic liberation—the church and the school in the Soviet Republic, it is stated:

In short, we see that the belief in God is a reflection of the commonest everyday relations. It is the belief in slavery which people are made to believe exists not only on the earth but in the whole universe. We understand that in reality there is nothing of the kind; and it is clear to everybody that such legends are behind the development of humanity.

Further on, on page 77, it continues:

Equally foolish things are done by the religious Jew, the Moslem Turk, the Buddhist Chinese—in a word, by everyone who believes in God. Hence it follows that really religious people are incapable of fighting. Religion, as we have shown, not only leaves people in a state of barbarism but helps to leave them in a state of slavery.

What then is the program of the Communists toward religion? The pamphlet concludes as follows:

All these considerations explain the program of the Communists with regard to their attitude to religion and to the church. Religion must be fought, if not by violence at all events, by argument. The church must be separated from the state. That means that the priests may remain but should be maintained by those who wish to accept their poison from them or by those who are interested in their existence.

There is a poison called opium. When it is smoked sweet visions appear. You feel as if you were in paradise, but its action tells on the health of the smoker. His health is gradually ruined, and little by little he becomes a meek idiot. The same applies to religion. There are people who wish to smoke opium, but it would be absurd if the state maintained at its expense—that is to say, at the expense of the people—opium dens and special men to serve them. For this reason the church must be—and already is—treated in the same way. Priests, bishops, archbishops, patriarchs, abbots and the rest of the lot must be refused state maintenance. Let the believers, if they wish it, feed the holy fathers at their own expense on the fat of the land, a thing which they, the priests, greatly appreciate.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Gitlow, you were one of the top leaders of the world Communist movement known as the Comintern, that is the Communist International. Perhaps you can give us the Comintern's position on religion.

Mr. GITLOW. I will be glad to.

The program of the Communist International under the section: The ultimate aim of the Communist International—world communism—declares:

This new culture of a humanity that is united for the first time in history, and has abolished all state boundaries, will, unlike capitalist culture, be based upon clear and transparent human relationships. Hence it will bury forever all mysticism, religion, prejudice, and superstition, and will give a powerful impetus to the development of all-conquering scientific knowledge.

But the Comintern goes much further than that, for in its program under the section dealing with the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and the Cultural Revolution the following quotes make quite clear the fundamental antireligious position of world communism.

The program herein declares:

One of the most important tasks of the cultural revolution affecting the wide masses is the task of systematically and unswervingly combating religion—the opium of the people. The proletarian government must withdraw all state support from the church, which is the agency of the former ruling class; it must prevent all church interference in state-organized educational affairs, and ruthlessly suppress the counterrevolutionary activity of the ecclesiastical organizations. At the same time the proletarian state, while granting liberty of worship and abolishing the privileged position of the formerly dominant religion, carries on antireligious propaganda with all the means at its command and reconstructs the whole of its educational work on the basis of scientific materialism.

The program of the Comintern in dealing with religion goes even further, for in its section dealing with the strategy and tactics of the Communist International in the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat, the following significant statement is made:

The confessional, religiously tinged tendency among the working class, finds expression in the confessional trade unions, which frequently are directly connected with corresponding bourgeois political organizations, and are affiliated to one or another of the church organizations of the dominant class, Catholic trade unions, Young Men's Christian Association, Jewish Zionist organizations, et cetera. All these tendencies, being the most striking conduct of the ideological captivity of certain strata of the proletariat, in most cases bear a romantic feudal tinge. By sanctifying all the abominations of the capitalistic regime with the holy water of religion and by terrorizing their flock with the specter of punishment in the world to come, the leaders of these organizations serve as the most reactionary units of the class enemy in the camp of the proletariat.

Mr. KUNZIG. If the Communist movement is an atheist movement, if that is the fundamental position as you have already indicated,

how is it possible, Mr. Gitlow, for the Communist Party, which attacks religion in the church, to pursue a policy that calls for the infiltration of churches and all kinds of religious institutions?

Mr. GITLOW. The Communist policy for the Communist infiltration of the religious field is a matter of tactics in the war against capitalism and religion. That is why the Communists have seldom engaged in a frontal attack upon religion and its institutions. That fact was graphically brought out when the Communist Party was organized in the United States in 1919. A group of delegates representing the Michigan State organization of the Socialist Party, which was expelled from the Socialist Party because it favored a Communist program, participated at the convention called together in the city of Chicago for the organization of the Communist Party. This delegation under the leadership of John Keracher and Dennis Batt, insisted that the Communist Party should in its program adopt a plan calling for an all-out campaign against religion as its main and immediate objective. When the Communist Party convention refused to do that, they bolted the convention, and upon the return of the delegation to Michigan organized what became known as the Proletarian Party. The Proletarian Party sought admission to the Communist International and endorsement of its position on religion. The Communist International endorsed the position of the Communist Party of the United States and directed the Proletarian Party to abandon its position, accept the program of the Communist Party of the United States, and join the party.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you mean to say that even though the Communist Party was an atheistic organization, it nevertheless adopted a policy for the infiltration of religious organizations?

Mr. GITLOW. The policy in those days was framed in such a way that the members of the Communist Party could infiltrate church organizations for the purpose of conducting their propaganda among them, for enlisting their support for Soviet Russia and for the various campaigns in which the Communists were interested.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Gitlow, the House Committee on Un-American Activities is interested, of course, in the valuable background of material which you are giving, but they are also interested in specific examples. Can you cite any specific examples of these tactics to which you are referring?

Mr. GITLOW. Certainly. The Russian Communists were the first to exploit ministers of the United States and through them, the church organizations, for the purpose of spreading propaganda in favor of Communist Russia and for the building up of a pro-Soviet sentiment among church people in America and among Americans generally.

I will, if I may, make mention of a few of the prominent American religious leaders who were used for that purpose in the early 1920's: Dr. Kirby Page, Dr. Sherwood Eddy, Jerome Davis, Dr. Harry F. Ward, the Rev. Albert Rhys Williams, and others. In reference to Albert Rhys Williams, it is interesting to note his biography. Albert Rhys Williams was a graduate of the Hartford Theological Seminary. He was a minister and director of the Maverick Church and Forum of Boston, Mass. When he went to Russia he became a Communist and got a job as assistant in the Commissariat of Foreign Affairs in the Soviet Government. He became a secret member of the Communist

Party of the United States. He worked for the Communists in preparing propaganda to foment a Communist revolution in Germany. He organized the International Legion in the Red Army.

In 1943 and 1944 Albert Rhys Williams, a paid agent of the Soviet Government, a secret member of the Communist Party, nevertheless, had such prominence in the United States that he became a lecturer at Cornell University for the years 1934 to 1944. He was also a contributing editor to the *Survey Graphic*, the leading magazine in the field of philanthropy and social service in the United States.

MR. KUNZIG. Mr. Gitlow, you have mentioned names of specific individuals, Dr. Kirby Page, Dr. Sherwood Eddy, Jerome Davis, Dr. Harry F. Ward, and the Reverend Albert Rhys Williams. Did you know of your own personal knowledge these persons to be Communists?

MR. GITLOW. The only one that I knew was a secret member of the Communist Party was Albert Rhys Williams. I knew that the others all worked closely with the Communist Party and also worked very closely when they were in Russia with the Soviet Government.

MR. WALTER. You say when they were in Russia. What did they go to Russia for?

MR. GITLOW. Well, they evidently went to Russia to see what happened as the result of the Russian revolution, and evidently they became so enthusiastic over what they were allowed to see that they became pliable material in the hands of the Communist leaders of Russia and then rendered very valuable service, too, because of the Soviet Government and the Communist movement.

MR. KUNZIG. Did the Communist Party of the United States in the early 1920's enlist the support of church people for its campaigns and in support of the Communist Party, its activities in Soviet Russia?

MR. GITLOW. It certainly did, for the number of ministers that actively supported the Communist Party in those days, though not as large as it is today, was, nevertheless, impressive. The outstanding clergymen among them were Dr. Harry F. Ward, Bishop William Montgomery Brown, Jerome Davis, William B. Spofford, and Albert Rhys Williams. The one that I know was a Communist Party member was Bishop William Montgomery Brown. The others cooperated closely with the Communist Party, and in the political committee of the Communist Party their activities on behalf of the Communist Party were continuously discussed. I also want to bring to your attention this fact: The joint legislative committee of the New York Legislature, in its report filed April 24, 1920, in dealing with Communist manifestations in the religious field, a report filed less than 8 months after the Communist Party was organized had this to say on the subject:

One of the few clergymen who have declared themselves frankly to be Bolshevik is Bishop William Montgomery Brown, a retired Episcopal clergyman, now at Galion, Ohio, a friend of radical Socialists and Communists who had been active for many years.

A more influential leader is the Reverend Harry F. Ward, professor in Union Theological Seminary, New York, and high in the councils of the Methodist Episcopal Church. He is leader in the intellectual field of the radical movement. His friendly attitude toward bolshevism, expressed in a textbook published by the Methodist Church, caused quite a public scandal, especially after it had been approved by an examining board of the church.

These few facts prove that from the very start the Communist Party, in spite of the fact that it was an atheistic organization, infiltrated the religious field and exploited clergymen of the various denominations for its purposes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Can you tell us how the Communists infiltrated the religious field?

Mr. GITLOW. Before I answer that question I believe it will help the committee to get a better understanding of the Communist technique if I deal briefly with the tactic of the united front adopted by the Communists in 1922 after they realized that their militant policy for instigating a revolution in Germany and then throughout Europe and the world had failed. The united-front policy by Lenin and approved by the Comintern became the official policy of the Communist Party of all countries, including the Communist Party of the United States. Its implementation in the United States resulted in the formation by the Communist Party of many united-front organizations and the initiation of a number of united-front actions.

The united-front tactic enabled the Communists to greatly increase the effectiveness of their infiltration activities. The united-front tactic was first directed toward the development of pro-Soviet sentiment and support of the Soviets; second, to build up support for the Communists in the trade unions and to create the organizations and conditions for their capture by the Communists; and third, to spread Communist propaganda, incite discontent among the people, undermine the loyalty of the American people and to divide them on religion, national, racial, and economic lines.

Mr. KUNZIG. What did the policy of the united front have to do with the infiltration of religion, Mr. Gitlow?

Mr. GITLOW. The united-front policy enabled the Communists to widely expand their infiltration activities on the religious field because instead of using the Communist Party directly in enlisting the support of clergymen and laymen who were pro-Soviet and supported the Communist Party and its activities, the Communist Party could enlist them through the front organizations, and on the specific issues of the united front. It was, for the Communists, for men and women operating in a field hostile to communism, to operate in the name of a front organization instead of in the name of the Communist Party. The front organization served as a shield to protect those individuals who were Communists or who explicitly carried out the Communist Party instructions from the charge that they were Communist agents. Besides, on specific issues the Communist Party, through the front organizations, was able to enlist a large number of individuals to follow its line, who under other circumstances would not do so.

To be specific: Before the creation of the front organizations, the ministers who carried out the instructions of the Communist Party or collaborated with it were limited in numbers.

The outstanding ones among them were, besides Dr. Harry Ward, Dr. William B. Spofford, Jerome Davis, Rev. Tucker P. Smith, Rev. Irwin St. John Tucker, Rabbi Judal L. Magnes, Rev. John Haynes Holmes, Rev. Sidney Strong, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise.

Then the Communist Party organized the Friends of the Soviet Union, the International Labor Defense, the All-American Anti-

Imperialist League, the Friends for Protection of Foreign Born, the movement for the organization of a national farmer-labor party, the Workers International Relief, numerous organizations in defense of strikes and for raising money for relief, youth organizations, student organizations, cultural organizations, forum and anti-imperialist actions like the Hands Off China Committee and many more. All these organizations had their share of clergymen. The number of clergymen who followed the Communist Party like grow by leaps and bounds.

Mr. WALTER. May I ask at this point, were all of those organizations that you mentioned known as the united front?

Mr. GITLOW. They were all organizations which the Communist Party termed united-front organizations.

Mr. WALTER. And by "united-front organizations" technically is meant organizations which are part and parcel of the Communist movement?

Mr. GITLOW. No. United-front organizations are organizations which are organized by the Communist Party through which they can enlist on specific issues the support of other organizations which are not Communist organizations and in which they can enlist the support of individuals who will go along with the Communist Party on a specific issue, but will not join the Communist Party on the issue of communism.

So when you have an anti-imperialist organization like a Hands Off China Committee, well, they can get all kinds of organizations to join that united-front movement and a lot of individuals who honestly are not Communists, but who think it is a good thing to have a Hands Off China movement and keep the imperialist army out of Chinese territory, and so you have united-front movements for civil rights, united-front movements for raising relief for workers out on strike, on a humanitarian basis. Then you have united-front organizations for the defense of the foreign born that appeal to all the foreign-born members of fraternal organizations of the United States, a tremendously powerful weapon in the hands of the Communist Party who are trying to divorce the foreign-born workers from American institutions and to bring them close to the Communist Party and the subversion of the Communist Party.

Mr. WALTER. Then by the united-front organizations you mean those organizations which unite together to carry out a specific purpose at a particular time?

Mr. GITLOW. And the initiative for the organization of which comes from the Communist Party.

Mr. SCHERER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you say that during that period the main field of the Communist Party's operations was the religious field?

Mr. GITLOW. No. The main field of the party's operations was the trade-union field and it still remains its main field of operations, but I would say that in the execution of the united-front policy, the religious field was second in importance. In recent years, especially in the United States, where the Communist Party is under attack, the religious field has become the most important.

Mr. KUNZIG. Who, would you say, is the key figure for the Communist Party on the religious field?

Mr. GITLOW. The key figure is Robert W. Dunn, head of the Labor Research Association.

Mr. KUNZIG. Will you explain why you consider him the key figure?

Mr. GITLOW. The Communist Party is the agency of the Soviet Government which it heads and directs the conspiracy to overthrow the United States Government by force and violence. Important figures in this conspiracy, who are members of the Communist Party, operate secretly. Only the most trusted leaders of the Communist Party know they are party members. Robert W. Dunn, who was connected with the Quakers' relief organization and with the Young Men's Christian Association, visited Russia. He became a pro-Soviet agent upon his return to the United States and was paid for his pro-Soviet propaganda. He joined the Communist Party of the United States when it was an underground organization, but functioned as a non-Communist and denied membership in the Communist Party. His wide acquaintance with religious organizations and religious personalities made him a person of great value to the party. He served as the Communist Party's liaison between its political committee and secretariat and the clergymen operating under instructions of the party. He also headed the research organization known as the Labor Research Association. This organization, which offered its services to labor unions and other organizations and prepared research material and statistics to back up the Communist Party line, functioned as a bona fide labor-research outfit. Through this organization the Communist Party obtained information of the innermost secrets of labor unions and other organizations that sought its services. The organization served as the research department of the Communist Party and Dunn's work was completely supervised by the party. In the twenties the church people who met together with Dunn and carried out the directions of the Communist Party in all matters were Jerome Davis, Albert Rhys Williams, Dr. Harry F. Ward, and William B. Spofford. This group wielded tremendous influence in the religious field and did trojan work in advancing the Communist conspiracy in religion.

Mr. KUNZIG. You were a member of various important committees of the Comintern and the Profintern. Did you, when you were in Moscow, ever discuss the question of Communist infiltration of religion with the leaders of the Comintern.

Mr. GITLOW. The matter came up in Moscow, not only in reference to the infiltration of religion in the United States, but also in the Far and Near East.

Mr. KUNZIG. Will you give us some specific instances?

Mr. GITLOW. My first visit to Moscow was in 1927 when I attended as a delegate of the American Communist Party the enlarged sessions of the executive committee of the Comintern. During my stay in Moscow, I also attended the sessions of the Anglo-American Secretariat, the organization committee of the Comintern, headed by Piatnitsky, had private sessions with the man in charge of archives of the Comintern who also headed the Comintern's agitprop department, sessions of which I also attended, and in addition had a long conference with Stalin. At the meetings of the Anglo-American Secretariat, also at meetings of the executive committee of the Communist International and of its organization department, the question of the American Communist Party's activities on the religious

field was discussed. At these meetings the Communist Party was directed to intensify its efforts to draw the religious elements into the party's united-front activities. In the organization of the Workers International Relief and in the various strike-relief agencies which the party set up independently or in conjunction with the Workers International Relief, the party was directed to draw in the religious elements and to give the clergymen, wherever possible, prominent roles in the activities of such organizations. The drawing in of religious elements by the Friends of the Soviet Union, and by the International Labor Defense, into the Communist Party's campaign for the formation of a farmer-labor party was also discussed. At the sessions of the organization department, the importance of establishing good contacts with the religious organizations so that the Communists could infiltrate the missions in China and use them for Communist purposes, was given serious consideration and special attention was drawn to the effective work which Dr. Harry F. Ward did for communism in China in 1924.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you mean to say that Dr. Ward engaged in Communist propaganda when he was in China in 1925?

Mr. GITLOW. Certainly. I would like to read a few excerpts from a series of lectures he delivered in China at that time, if I may.

Mr. KUNZIG. You may.

Mr. GITLOW. Dr. Ward delivered a series of lectures at the National University at Peking under the title, "The Ethical Aspects of Industrialization." The first lecture was called, *The Ethical Problems Created by Industrialization*, delivered on March 3, 1925. Describing the industrial system under which we live Dr. Ward said:

More than this, industrialism is in conflict also with the desires of man concerning the future. I do not know if you can find a parallel in human history to this situation in which the prevailing way of getting the work of the world done has developed a way of thinking and living which is at the same time dangerous both to the established moral standards of mankind and also to the aspirations of man as he reaches out into the future.

Ward here develops in his own words, the words of the clergy, of the Communist idea that capitalist industrialism under which we live today has developed a way of thinking, that it is an ideology that is outmoded, that no longer serves mankind progressively. Dr. Ward, however, puts it in the language of the clergyman as a way of thinking dangerous to moral standards and the aspirations of man, as he reaches out into the future for another system different from capitalism.

Dr. Ward continues,

This period is somewhat analogous to the time in the political history of any country when there is guerrilla warfare between military leaders, preceding the establishment of constitutional control. Industrialism is now in that state because we have not yet set up any constitutional control of economic activities.

This quotation is an assertion and approval of the Communist position that the overthrow of capitalism goes through the process of guerrilla class warfare to put the state in control of all economic activities. Dr. Ward calls this constitutional control; actually, it is communism.

Dr. Ward repeats the Communist charge that under capitalism wage earners live under a system of wage slavery in these terms:

The limitations of the personality of many wage earners by what is accurately called wage slavery, has been fully described in the literature of both sympathy and revolt.

The second lecture Dr. Ward delivered in China before a distinguished audience of intellectuals and students was called *Can Capitalism Provide a Solution?* It was delivered on March 5, 1925. In this lecture Dr. Ward takes the Communist position that it does not pay to reform capitalism, that it must be destroyed completely. Here are some of his pertinent remarks:

It is not necessary to recount the sins of modern capitalism against humanity. * * * For our present purpose we can afford to admit that these things may possibly be eliminated by reform. The issue then is whether their elimination will require such an expenditure of energy, such a struggle, as to consume more than it is worth (pp. 17-18).

Then Dr. Ward develops this position against a competitive system of economy as follows:

Hence it comes about that the competitive system blocks progress where formerly it helped it (p. 20).

Dr. Ward's estimation of American capitalism is a gem. He said:

One of the outstanding facts of the modern world is the increased recognition of the inadequacy of the capitalist system. * * * In fact today capitalism is defended only by people whom a friend of mine described as Wall Street morons—that is, people who have been so engrossed in the making of money that they are really feeble-minded insofar as the rest of life is concerned (p. 26).

In his third lecture, *What we may expect from socialism*, delivered March 7, 1925, Dr. Ward said:

All the different schools of socialism agree in proposing the collective control of life. * * * Indeed in this respect, they are simply advancing what may be defended only by the natural evolutionary process of humanity. * * * In furtherance of this movement socialism at large proposes the intelligent guidance of human affairs to a chosen end. Concretely, it means in general the use of the state for purposes of social welfare and not merely for purposes of governmental regulations. * * * In that respect the British Labor Party and the Russian Communist Party are one. * * * They both insist upon the fullest possible use of science for intelligent control of human affairs (p. 30).

In this statement Dr. Ward rejects government regulation for state control of the general welfare. Here, Dr. Ward speaks as a believer in socialism, accepting the Communist position on the absolute powers of the state over all human affairs.

All the lectures delivered in China by Dr. Ward had for its main purpose bolstering up the position of the Communist movement in China and winning support of the Chinese intellectuals and Christians in China for the Chinese Communist movement and for Soviet Russia.

In his fourth lecture, *What Has Science to Offer*, the title is misleading. It should have been, *What Has Communism to Offer*. Dr. Ward, on March 10, 1925, said the following:

In Russia a government has been organized with the deliberate purpose of endeavoring to develop a cooperative commonwealth in which finally there would be no economic classes, where all the people will share in the culture of life in the same terms. And there has been recognized in some other countries a "society for technical aid to Russia," a recognition of the fact that the accomplishment of the goal requires a large technical development. The situation is an index of what has been done in the large throughout the world (p. 43).

The Society for Technical Aid to Russia, which Dr. Ward, refers to, in the United States was organized upon instructions of the Soviet government for supplying an agency for carrying on quasi-government activities for the Soviet government. It was used to facilitate travel into the Soviet Union by issuing visas and passports for the

Russian Government. It greatly aided the movement of Soviet spies into and out of the United States. It served as an important industrial espionage agency for the Soviet government in both the United States and in Canada.

He follows this declaration for Russia and communism with an endorsement of Marxism in these words:

Take an instance again from the field of political science. One of the most useful tools we have at present in that field is the economic interpretation of history, which was first developed by Marx in collaboration with Engels (p. 54).

He winds up his lecture with a stirring appeal the intent of which is that the Chinese should follow in the footsteps of the Communists in Russia, in words not based upon the Bible, but on Leninism, as follows:

But in Russia some years ago there happened to come along a young student whose name has later become famous to the world as Lenin, and who used this tool of the economic interpretation of history to develop a theory and a tactic of social change. He used it to accomplish results which will be felt throughout the history of the human race as long as time stands (p. 54).

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you attach any special significance to Dr. Ward's lectures in China?

Mr. GITLOW. I only presented Ward's lectures delivered in China in 1925 because they were discussed at length in Moscow at the Comintern. The Comintern leaders were of the opinion that clergymen, with Dr. Ward's point of view, using the cloak of religion, could render service of inestimable value to the Communist cause in China and to Soviet interests. Besides, the missions and church institutions in China could be used, in the opinion of the Comintern, to cover up Communist espionage activities in China. Clergymen, who served in various capacities in China, and who deliberately followed the Communist Party line or were duped into following it, formed an important branch of the conspiracy to turn China over to the Communists. They not only gave assistance to the Communists in China but they also carried on effective propaganda in the United States to influence public opinion for their point of view. Later in my testimony I will show how the Methodist Federation for Social Action was tied into the China conspiracy.

Mr. KUNZIG. You mentioned about the Near East and religious infiltration. Will you please elaborate?

Mr. GITLOW. The Comintern was dissatisfied with the progress the Communists were making in the Near East. The area, because of its large oil deposits, and because it served as a link to Asia and Africa was considered of tremendous strategic importance, if the grip of western capitalism represented by Great Britain and the United States was to be broken. But the Communist penetration of that area was not proceeding as desired in spite of the enormous sums of money which the Comintern and the Soviet government spent in that area. The Comintern executive reached the conclusion that to be successful in advancing the cause of communism in the Mohammedan countries of that area, it would be necessary for the Communists to infiltrate the religious forces that exerted such great political influence in that area. Special schools were established to train Communist agents in the traditions and customs of the Mohammedan religion. In Moscow a school was established called the Mid Eastern University. This train-

ing school was the pet project of Joseph Stalin and had a student body of 5,000.

Mr. KUNZIG. When did the Communist infiltration of religion become a major policy of the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. GITLOW. It certainly did. On August 20, 1935, with a full delegation of the Communist Party of the United States present, a resolution was adopted unanimously dealing with the preparation of the imperialists for a new world war. This resolution declared:

The establishment of a united front with social-democratic and reformist organizations (party, trade unions, cooperative, sport, and cultural and educational organizations), and with the bulk of their members, as well as with mass national liberation, religious, democratic, and pacifist organizations and their adherents, is decisive in the struggle against war and its Fascist instigators in all countries.

The resolution is very specific for it states that a united front on the part of the Communists and the organizations they control, with religious organizations and their adherents, is decisive in the struggle against war and fascism. The passage of this resolution by the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International proves that Communist infiltration of the religious field was decided upon in Moscow as a major policy. Those who declare that such infiltration of religion, especially the Christian churches, is a figment of the imagination, either do so to hide the astounding facts about such infiltration or because they are too stupid to see or realize what is going on.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did the American Communists play a part in formulating the policy of the Comintern for the infiltration of the religious field?

Mr. GITLOW. The American Communists played quite an important part. Gil Green, the head of the Young Communist League of the United States, reported in Moscow, as follows:

We are influencing larger masses of youth and are accepted by large numbers of them as a constructive force. In these organizations we found innumerable functionaries and cadres to fight with us against reaction. * * * In the course of less than a year our Young Communist League built 175 units within these mass organizations and through these began to anchor the united front from below.

* * * At the second American Youth Congress, the Young Communist League delegation was faced with many complicated questions, any one of which if handled in a broad way could have resulted in a break in the united front. For example, the question of religion. Many of the religious groups were skeptical about uniting with Communists, although they were against fascism, because they feared that was a trap to force our atheistic views upon them. This problem was solved by simply agreeing to permit all religious youth in the Congress to hold church services Sunday morning. This did not compromise the Communist youth and yet showed to the masses of religious youth that this was not a united front against religion but against political reaction.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did the Communist infiltration of religion, on an intensified scale, begin in the United States before the decisions of the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern in 1935?

Mr. GITLOW. It actually was in full swing in the United States in 1934. The Seventh World Conference of the Comintern only reiterated and greatly stressed, as I have already indicated, what had always been the policy of the world Communist movement.

Mr. KUNZIG. What were the main organizations through which the Communist conspiracy in religion was carried out?

Mr. GITLOW. The Methodist Federation for Social Action and organizations patterned after it in the other religious denominations and the united-front organizations set up by the Communist Party. The united-front organizations which recruited thousands of ministers, through which the Communist infiltration of religion was carried on on a grand scale and was highly successful, were the American League Against War and Fascism, later changed to the American League for Peace and Democracy, and the American Youth Congress.

Mr. KUNZIG. What kind of an organization was the Methodist Federation for Social Action, and how did it differ from a Communist-front organization?

Mr. GITLOW. The Methodist Federation for Social Action, originally called the Methodist Federation for Social Service was first organized by a group of Socialist, Marxist clergymen of the Methodist Church, headed by Dr. Harry F. Ward. Dr. Ward was the organizer, for almost a lifetime its secretary and actual leader. He at all times set its ideological and political pattern. Its objective was to transform the Methodist Church and Christianity into an instrument for the achievement of socialism. It was established in 1907, 12 years before the organization of the Communist Party of the United States in 1919. The outbreak of the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia in November 1917 had a tremendous effect upon the Socialist ministers of this organization and especially upon Dr. Ward. When the Communist Party was organized in 1919, Dr. Ward was already a convinced Communist with a few insignificant minor reservations. By 1920 he was already, though not yet a member of the Communist Party, cooperating and collaborating with the Communist Party. This collaboration of Dr. Ward with the Communist Party was reflected in the expressions and activities of the Methodist Federation for Social Action. The inner hard core of the Methodist Federation consisted, up to the time Jack R. McMichael, a member and leader of the Young Communist League, was elected its executive secretary, after Dr. Ward had relinquished his post, of a Communist cell headed by Ward, which functioned under the direction of the Communist Party. McMichael became the cell's head but Dr. Ward continued to be a part of it. The Methodist Federation for Social Action was always in the grip of this Communist Party cell and was therefore an instrument through which the Communist Party operated on the religious field. It was not, therefore, a typical Communist united-front organization, set up by the Communist Party, which invites other organizations to affiliate and participate in the affairs of the united-front organization. One of the main functions of a united-front organization is to put the Communist Party in contact with the leaders of mass organizations whose membership runs into the thousands and millions. The party seeks through the united-front organizations to recruit into the party those leaders who cooperate with the party and to destroy those leaders who oppose the Communist Party. In addition, it gives the party free access to the millions of members drawn together by the united front to mobilize them in support of Communist Party actions and to recruit large numbers of them directly into the party. The united-front organizations also act as a cover for Communist infiltration activities in other fields for sabotage and espionage purposes.

The Methodist Federation for Social Action is a membership organization made up entirely of Methodists. It does not affiliate other organizations with it. The Communist Party is not included as an affiliate. The organization is a Communist Party instrument controlled by the Communist Party through the Communist cell secretly operating as a Communist Party disciplined unit in the federation.

Mr. KUNZIG. What were the connections between the Methodist Federation for Social Action and the two Communist-front organizations you mentioned that played such an important role in the Communist infiltration of religion.

Mr. GITLOW. In the first place the Methodist Federation for Social Action was affiliated with and collaborated most closely with the American League Against War and Fascism, and the American League for Peace and Democracy, and the American Youth Congress. It was no accident that Dr. Ward, the organizer and leader of the Methodist Federation, became the chairman, and served in that capacity for many years, of both the American League Against War and Fascism and the American League for Peace and Democracy. Rev. Jack McMichael was the chairman for many years of the American Youth Congress.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did Dr. Ward use his position as chairman of the American League Against War and Fascism to aid the Communist conspiracy for the infiltration of the churches?

Mr. GITLOW. He did. Let me quote from an article Dr. Ward wrote in the August 1934 Fight, the official publication of the American League Against War and Fascism. In the article "Churches and Fascism," Dr. Ward wrote:

They live narrow starved lives with no knowledge of economics or politics, no interest in science, no contacts with literature or art. Their religion supplies them with an opiate that takes them into the dream world. They are the natural followers of a powerful demagogue who can deceive them with vague promises and revolutionary phrases. When their economic security is gone or threatened, their undisciplined emotions can quickly be turned into hate of the Jew, the Communist, the Negro. The only preventative serum that will make them immune from these poisonous germs is propaganda in emotional terms that enables them to locate the real enemy. The people who come to know that the capitalist system is the source of their economic troubles are not easily led to chase and beat scapegoats. * * * *To work at that task the American League Against War and Fascism needs to get members in all religious organizations.*

Mr. KUNZIG. Was Dr. Ward the only official of the Methodist Federation of Social Action who was an official of the American League Against War and Fascism?

Mr. GITLOW. He was not the only one. There were many officials of the Methodist Federation who held important posts in the American League Against War and Fascism. One of them was the Reverend Charles C. Webber, an instructor in the Union Theological Seminary and cosecretary of the Methodist Federation with Dr. Ward. He was on the executive staff of the American League Against War and Fascism in charge of the important department of affiliations. During that period he was an instructor in the department of church and community. In Fight of July 1935, in the article "Christians and the Fight for Social Justice," Webber wrote:

The New Deal (the Communist Party in 1935 was anti-New Deal. When the Communist Party became pro-New Deal, it [the American League Against War and Fascism] instantaneously became pro-New Deal), instead of being a step toward greater equality and justice, has established economic fascism.

Capitalism stands condemned by the principles of Christian ethics.

What then can we, who are church members, do in the struggle to abolish capitalism and to build a planned social order?

Reverend Mr. Webber then proceeds to outline a detailed program for the infiltration of the churches to get church members to join the struggle to abolish capitalism, the system of society under which we live, and build a planned social order; that is, communism. His article continues:

This data must be published in such a form as to be available for use in Sunday schools, open forums, and sermons.

A comprehension of the unethical, un-Christian character of capitalism, thus gained, gives us a base from which to wage a vigorous attack. * * * It therefore becomes all the more necessary for the militant minority of the church to affiliate with the forces of the religious, labor, political, women's, fraternal, and youth groups in the league.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did the league, of which Dr. Ward was chairman, have a religious section?

Mr. GITLOW. It certainly did, and a flourishing one it was by 1936. Dr. Herman F. Reissig headed the religious section of the American League Against War and Fascism. Dr. Reissig has a long and notorious record of affiliation with Communist-front organizations. I will mention a few of them. The Friends of the Soviet Union, the International Labor Defense, American branch of the "MOPR," a Moscow organization; North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy, and many more. One Communist-front he was connected with, the Mother Bloor Celebration Committee, had 71 sponsors, 40 of whom were card-carrying members of the Communist Party. Its officers were all members of the Communist Party.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did Dr. Ward's American League for Peace and Democracy and the American League Against War and Fascism participate in the international peace offensive initiated by the Soviet Government as an important part of its political-warfare strategy against the United States?

Mr. GITLOW. It did very actively. In fact, Dr. Ward headed a delegation to the Communist World Peace Congress held in Brussels, which included prominent clergymen and delegates from many important religious organizations.

Mr. KUNZIG. You mentioned something about the American Youth Congress; that it played an important role in the Communist infiltration of the religious field, and that McMichael was chairman of the organization. Will you please elaborate more specifically about the organization?

Mr. GITLOW. In his report to the World Congress of the Comintern held in Moscow in 1935, Gil Green spoke in the most glowing terms about the American Youth Congress. He told the leaders of world communism gathered in Moscow the following:

The Young Communist League will continue to support and help extend and broaden the American Youth Congress.

It was clear from Gill Green's report that the American Youth Congress, which first started out to be a patriotic organization, under the sponsorship of such good Americans as Gene Tunney, James Farley, Herbert Hoover, and others, was captured by the Communist Party with the aid of allies in one of the religious youth organizations, to turn the organization into a subversive Communist front.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did the Communist Party, as did the Young Communist League, have a hand in the affairs of the American Youth League?

Mr. GITLOW. It certainly did, for the organization gave the Communist Party access to the White House. President Roosevelt received its representatives, and Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt attended its national conferences, approved many of its major decisions, and pampered its leaders. Earl Browder, who was general secretary of the Communist Party at the time, wrote in the *New Masses* of June 11, 1935, the following:

Here, in America, last August 9, 1934, it was the united front of religious youth organizations, together with Socialists and the Communists, which defeated the Fascist-inspired Viola Ilma, with her Washington support, and turned the American Youth Congress into an inspiring mass movement of youth throughout the country against war and fascism.

Mr. KUNZIG. Who was Viola Ilma?

Mr. GITLOW. Viola Ilma, branded by Browder a Fascist, was a patriotic young American, who sought with the support of outstanding patriotic citizens to organize an American youth organization loyal to the United States.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did Browder in his article have anything to say about the Communist infiltration of religious youth organizations?

Mr. GITLOW. He did. He said:

Who could be so utterly stupid to suggest that the Young Communists should keep themselves pure and uncontaminated by association with these religious youth organizations by withdrawing from this great mass movement?

Mr. KUNZIG. Did Browder in his article touch on the leadership of the Young Communists in the American Youth League?

Mr. GITLOW. What he wrote in regard to the leadership of the Young Communists and their success in infiltrating religious youth organizations is indeed significant. Here are his words:

In fact, most of the religious youth will fight to a finish to maintain the leading position of the Young Communists in the Youth Congress movement.

In Browder's own words, not only did the Young Communists successfully infiltrate the religious youth organizations of the country, in fact, the Communists were so successful in their infiltration tactics that the religious youth leaders in the American Youth Congress would fight to a finish, to the bitter end, to maintain the Young Communists in the leading position in the youth movement.

Mr. KUNZIG. If the Communists had the leading position in the American Youth Congress when McMichael was its chairman, would you say that the Communists also held the leading position in the American League Against War and Fascism when Dr. Ward was its chairman?

Mr. GITLOW. The Communist leadership and control of the organization under Dr. Ward's chairmanship was undisputed and proven by the makeup of the staff that ran the organization together with Ward.

Mr. KUNZIG. Could you give us the facts?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes. Dr. Ward's staff consisted of the following: Organizer—Waldo McNutt, member of the Communist Party; administration—Ida Dailes, member of the Communist Party, organizer of the Communist children's organization known as the Pioneers. She was also a confidential secretary of the national office of the Commu-

nist Party connected with espionage activities, and was attached to Whittaker Chambers when he was active in the Communist spy ring; publications—Liston Oak, editor of Soviet Russia Today, member of the Communist Party, and a Communist agent in the Spanish Civil War; Dorothy McConnell, whose tie-in with the women's department of the Communist Party is a matter of record. She is a member of the Methodist Federation for Social Action; James Lerner, member of the National Council of the Young Communist League, member of the Communist Party, and on the staff of the Daily Worker; Rev. Charles C. Webber, already referred to in my previous testimony as a loyal follower of the Communist Party line. This analysis of Dr. Ward's staff, I think is sufficient proof of the Communist control and leadership of Dr. Ward's organization. In 1937 the American League against War and Fascism was changed to the American League for Peace and Democracy. Ward retained the presidency of the new organization. Fight of March 1938 reports that Steve Nelson joined the league's executive staff and is directing the membership drive. Steve Nelson was a member of the national committee and the political committee of the Communist Party. He was in charge of espionage activities. Later on he directed atomic espionage activities for the Communist Party.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you prepared to go into the situation in the American Youth Congress?

Mr. GITLOW. I am.

Mr. KUNZIG. When was Jack R. McMichael elected chairman of the American Youth Congress?

Mr. GITLOW. He was elected chairman of the American Youth Congress in 1939. It may interest the members of this committee to know that there is on file in the New York Public Library the copy of a strictly confidential memo on the American Youth Congress which states:

The majority of the officers have always been identifiable with Communist Party or known party affiliates.

Mr. KUNZIG. Who were some of the signers of the Call of the American Youth Congress of 1939 that elected Jack R. McMichael chairman?

Mr. GITLOW. The signers to the Call included J. P. Davis, Communist Party leader now in prison, Max Yergan, Communist Party member, Reid Robinson, Communist Party member, Jerome Davis, Soviet Government propagandist and agent, Robert Morss Lovett of the University of Chicago, a staunch supporter of the Communist Party. At this congress the national representatives of the Young Communist League were officially seated as delegates and constituted the driving force in the Communist steering committee that directed the affairs of the Youth Congress sessions. Also participating were delegates representing 20 national Communist-front organizations and Communist-controlled unions.

Mr. KUNZIG. Who recommended Jack McMichael for the chairmanship of the American Youth Congress?

Mr. GITLOW. The National Council of the American Youth Congress which consisted, with the exception of Joseph P. Lash, of the American Student Union, who went along with the Communists, of Communist Party members. Gil Green, head of the Young Commu-

nists League, was a member of the council, and so was James Lerner, a member of the National Committee of the Young Communist League.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was Jack McMichael present at the Congress held in July 1939, in New York City?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; he was present as a delegate representing the National Intercollegiate Christian Council, of which organization he was the president. He had just returned from a 10-month trip through China as a representative of American Christian student youth groups.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did the delegates representing Christian youth organizations actively participate in the affairs of the 1939 conference?

Mr. GITLOW. They did. J. Carroll Morris, chairman of the Christian Youth Council of North America made a speech at the conference in which he said:

We feel that the American Youth Congress is a good movement that is trying to express for all young people some of the things we have felt as Christian youth coming out of our religious background.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did any religious leader of note express his opinion on the American Youth Congress?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes. Dr. Ward.

Mr. KUNZIG. What did he say?

Mr. GITLOW. Murray Plavner in his book, *Is the American Youth Congress a Communist Front*, a book endorsed by Gene Tunney, disclosed that Dr. Ward stated at a Communist caucus, held in Milwaukee during the sessions of the American Youth Congress in 1937, the following:

So today the Youth Congress and the Communist Party programs are still very much alike.

Dr. Ward was among the 20 Communist Party officials of the Communist Party and Communist-front organizations to address the congress.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did the American Youth Congress, through which the Communists so successfully infiltrated religious youth organizations, help the antireligious atheistic drive of the Communists which was carried on at the same time?

Mr. GITLOW. I can answer this question best by quoting the words of Earl Browder who was then the general secretary of the Communist Party. He wrote in the *New Masses* of June 11, 1935, the following:

Does this united front soften down the antireligious work of the Communists? No, on the contrary, it has aroused a great interest among religious people as to the Communist position and brought about a tremendous increase in the circulation of our antireligious position.

Browder gives the answer, the real objective behind the Communist infiltration of the religious field is the destruction of religion and its substitution by atheism.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was the Methodist Federation for Social Action affiliated with the American Youth Congress?

Mr. GITLOW. It was, and so was the National Council of Methodist Youth. Let me show you how close the relationship was between the American Youth Congress and the Methodist Federation for Social Action. The Sixth American Youth Congress was held in July of 1940 at the College Camp, Lake Geneva, Wis., under the chairmanship of McMichael. It was called "Keep America Out of War Congress."

That was the slogan of the Communist Party in 1940 which supported the Soviet-Nazi pact. The delegates manual issued by the conference contained this note prominently:

Where to Go for Information.

Methodist Federation for Social Service, Social Questions Bulletin, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Mr. KUNZIG. What did the Communists in the youth field do after Hitler broke his alliance with Stalin?

Mr. GITLOW. The Communists transformed the Young Communist League into the American Youth for Democracy.

Mr. KUNZIG. Why was this done?

Mr. GITLOW. This was done mainly in order that the young Communists ready to enter the Armed Forces, under the guise of an organization for democracy, could as Communists obtain strategic positions in the Armed Forces, in the defense industries, and in the civilian defense organization. Second, the Communists through this organization hoped, in the name of patriotism and war effort, to rally the youth of the country and especially the young men of the Armed Forces behind the issues the Communists raised.

Mr. KUNZIG. What kind of an organization was the American Youth for Democracy?

Mr. GITLOW. It was a Communist Party youth organization. All the leading officers of the organization were either members of the Young Communist League or of the Communist Party. Its cochairman was Robert Thompson, one of the convicted Communist leaders, now a fugitive from justice. The editor of AYD Spotlight, its official magazine, Claudia Jones has also been convicted under the Smith Act as a top leader of the Communist Party.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did any well-known figures in the religious field sponsor this out-and-out Communist youth organization?

Mr. GITLOW. Of course. The following sponsored the American Youth for Democracy. All of them have had either the closest relations to the MFSA or have been among its members and officers, namely, William B. Spofford, Mary McLeod Bethune, Prof. Dirk J. Struik, and Prof. Walter Rautenstrauch.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did Dr. Ward have anything to do with this organization?

Mr. GITLOW. He supported the organization and was a contributor to its magazine, the AYD Spotlight. In the December 1943 issue he wrote an article explaining why Soviet youth fight so well. Let me read you a quotation from his article:

So today having built with a fighting spirit a greater amount of social construction than any other generation was able to accomplish in like time, Soviet youth is defending what it has built * * *. In the broadest outlines Lenin, long ago, told them it meant more freedom and more equality for all.

No Communist could write a more exaggerated laudatory article on the Soviet slave system, and only a Communist could quote Lenin as Dr. Ward did as an authority on equality and freedom, for Lenin was the first Communist dictator in the world.

Mr. KUNZIG. Has Communist activity in the youth field continued to be tied in with the Communist conspiracy in the religious field?

Mr. GITLOW. It has. Let me give you an example. On May 28, 1949, the Labor Youth League was organized. The chairman of the

National Organizing Conference for a Labor Youth League was Leon Wofsy, a member and leader of the Communist Party. His report of the organization of the Labor Youth League is printed in pamphlet form under the title, "For a Youth Organization Dedicated to Education in the Spirit of Socialism." This youth organization, launched in 1949, functioned as the youth section of the Communist Party.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did religious youth organizations participate at the conference of the Labor Youth League?

Mr. GITLOW. They did. I will read to you from Wofsy's report, page 17:

First of all, through the study of Marxism, young people will be able to learn in our organization an understanding of the class nature of our society and why the working class is "the source of progress in the modern world."

On page 18:

Second, in our organization young people will be able to learn about working-class internationalism and how it is indivisible from love of country * * *. This is the fundamental patriotic content of the recent inspiring statements for peace and international solidarity by Paul Robeson and by Foster and Dennis in our country, and by Communists and outstanding progressives of almost every other country in the world.

After continuing to outline the Communist program of the Labor Youth League, Wofsy makes this pertinent remark:

We will encourage and support every expression for peace on the part of the youth striving to help set in motion young people who are confused and even hostile (under the influence of red baiting) to leading forces in the peace camp.

In this connection, we greet the recent statement of youth leaders opposing the North Atlantic war pact. It is signed by outstanding national leaders, as individuals of the National Conference of Methodist Youth, the National Council of Jewish Youth, the Young Progressives of America, the National Student Council of the Young Men's Christian Association.

This clearly indicates that the intent remains Communist infiltration of religious organization for the Communist "peace" offensive and against the Atlantic Pact.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did the Communists in 1949 use their contacts on the religious field to further their cause?

Mr. GITLOW. They did through the Young Progressives of America. In the pamphlet, Down Main Road, on page 14, the following statement appears:

The events of the past 15 months have confirmed the fact that 2 paths lie open before the entire American people. One is the path of armaments, the North Atlantic Military Pact, following the cold war to its bloody catastrophic end. The other is the path of negotiation of outstanding differences between the United States and the Soviet Union, without sacrifice of the national interests of either, and the strengthening of the United Nations.

This is what 160 national youth leaders said, upon the invitation, in their individual capacities, of the chairman of the National Youth Committee of the Protestant Episcopal Church; of an assistant professor of religion at Morehouse College in Atlanta, and past field secretary of the Negro YMCA in the South; of the then cochairman of the Intercollegiate Christian Council; of the chairman of the Committee of National Organizations of the National Conference of Jewish Youth Organizations; of the then program secretary of the student YMCA, who is also a national vice chairman of the YPA:

"We fully associate ourselves with the sentiments therein expressed."

Mr. KUNZIG. You stated that the Communist infiltration of religion was decided upon at the World Congress of the Comintern on August 20, 1935, as a major Communist united-front tactic. Did Moscow follow up this resolution with an appeal to the clergymen of the world?

Mr. GITLOW. It did.

Mr. KUNZIG. In what form was the Soviet appeal to the clergymen of the world made?

Mr. GITLOW. The drive, on a world scale for the Communist infiltration of religion, was started by Romain Rolland's famous letter to the clergymen of the world, first issued in September 1935, printed in the Communist and pro-Soviet press of the world. It first appeared in the United States in the November 1935 issue of Soviet Russia Today. A significant quote is the following:

The results are gigantic. You and your friends can go and see for yourselves. For the U. S. S. R. today is accessible to all and its doors are wide open * * * You will see a social faith which is equal to, and in my mind, surpasses all the religious faiths, for it is at the service of the entire human future.

Romain's appeal to the clergy of the world, of all religious denominations, which Romain was forced to write at the behest of the Communist International and the Soviet Government, contains unvarnished the statement that communism as practiced in the Soviet Union surpasses all religious faiths, therefore, leaving the conclusion that it should become the accepted religion of mankind.

Mr. KUNZIG. Why are the Communists so interested in enlisting the support of clergy and in infiltrating religious organizations of all kinds?

Mr. GITLOW. Religion through the clergy and its various institutions interlocks with and influences practically every field of human endeavor. I will attempt to list religious important contact points: The military, through the chaplains in the armed services; education, labor, youth, and women; international affairs, mainly through the missions maintained by the churches; children; business; publishing—the religious organizations maintain large and extensive publishing houses and publish numerous magazines, pamphlets, and leaflets dealing with almost every subject interesting mankind; as an integral part of the cultural life of the country; its social agencies are of tremendous importance and it holds a key position in philanthropy; it is tied in with numerous foundations; wields tremendous influence politically.

The Communists would consider themselves fools and idiots to neglect such an important field as the religious field, for religion exerts its direct influence on life, it can truthfully be said, from the cradle to the grave.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did the Communists infiltrate the Methodist Church?

Mr. GITLOW. In the infiltration of the Methodist Church, the Communists were highly successful. To detail the extent of the Communist infiltration of the Methodist Church, the people who served the Communists in the Church consciously and those who were its stooges would take several hundred pages of testimony.

Mr. KUNZIG. Who were the principal individuals involved in Communist infiltration of the Methodist Church?

Mr. GITLOW. The principal individuals involved in the Communist conspiracy to subvert the Methodist Church for Communist purposes are: Dr. Harry F. Ward, Rev. Jack R. McMichael, Rev. Charles C. Webber, Rev. Alson J. Smith, Dr. Willard Uphaus, Margaret Forsyth, Rev. Lee H. Ball, and Prof. Walter Rautenstrauch.

Mr. KUNZIG. What organization, in your opinion, played a most important part in the Communist infiltration of religion?

Mr. GITLOW. In my opinion the Methodist Federation for Social Action. First, it set the pattern for the setting up of similar organizations in the other Protestant denominations. It, in fact, assumed the leadership of the so-called social action movement in the Christian churches, and greatly influenced their ideas and the programs they adopted and their activities. It maintained the closest relations with all of them and often collaborated with them. In addition, the Methodist Federation for Social Action officially affiliated with some of the most important Communist-front organizations. Those with which the Methodist Federation for Social Action did not officially affiliate with, the organization usually endorsed, sponsored or supported through its Social Questions Bulletin or through the recognized leaders of the federation.

Mr. KUNZIG. The names of those you mentioned as the most important principals involved in the Communist infiltration of the Methodist Church, were they affiliated with the Communist Party and Communist-front organizations?

Mr. GITLOW. All of them have long records of affiliation and sponsorship and activities in Communist-front organizations.

Mr. KUNZIG. Will you briefly give us the record of some of them?

Mr. GITLOW. Certainly. I will deal with the records of Dr. Ward and the Reverend McMichael separately. Here is the record of Rev. Alson J. Smith. The Reverend Smith signed an open letter to Congress attacking the Atlantic Pact. Reverend Smith is an important leader of the Methodist Federation for Social Action. He edited its Social Questions Bulletin. He figures prominently in the Social Questions Bulletin as a reviewer of books and motion pictures. In his writings and editorials in the Social Questions Bulletin and in some of the official publications of Communist-front organizations, he has always followed the Communist Party line. That he was considered by the Communists an important figure in the Communist infiltration of the religious field is attested by the fact that he was the secretary and driving spirit of the religious committee of the American League for Peace and Democracy, New York City Division, and devoted his time, unusual intellectual capacities, and organizing ability in establishing religious branches of the league for the purpose of facilitating the Communist infiltration of religion. He was a member of the Youth Committee for May Day in 1940. The Youth Committee for May Day was an adjunct of the Communist Party engaged in assisting the Communist Party in its May Day parade and demonstration. The other Communist fronts with which the Reverend Smith was connected were the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, American Committee to Save Refugees, National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. He was also a contributor to Equality and the New Masses, official magazines of the Communist Party.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is the record of Dr. Willard Uphaus?

Mr. GITLOW. Dr. Willard Uphaus has a long Communist-front record. He was connected with the following Communist-front organizations: The American Friends of Spanish Democracy, the American Youth Congress, the Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges, the Committee of One Thousand, the National Council to Aid Agricultural Labor, the Workers Alliance, the National Federation for Con-

stitutional Liberties, and the People's Institute of Applied Religion, a most important Communist organization in the religious field, functioning mainly in the South.

Mr. KUNZIG. How about Margaret Forsyth?

Mr. GITLOW. She was a steady contributor to Fight, the official journal of the American League for Peace and Democracy. Her articles followed the Communist Party line. She also contributed to other Communist publications.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you wish to mention the record of some of the others?

Mr. GITLOW. I do. The record of the Reverend Lee H. Ball indicates the close relationship between leaders of the Methodist Federation for Social Action and Communist-front organizations. He signed an open letter to Congress attacking the Atlantic pact. The Communist Party and the Soviet Government made a lot of capital out of the fact that a large number of ministers signed this open letter. That Ball signed this letter was no surprise, because he was connected with the following fronts: American Committee for Indonesian Independence, the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born (this was a Moscow-sponsored organization, organized by the Communist Party and controlled by it 100 percent), American Peace Mobilization, the China Welfare Fund, the Committee for Citizenship Rights, the Committee of One Thousand, signer of statement defending the Communist Party, the Cultural Workers in Motion Pictures and Other Arts, the International Workers Order, the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights, the editorial adviser of the Protestant (a notorious Communist religious magazine), the Rural Youth Association, and the Schappes Defense Committee.

Mr. KUNZIG. What do you consider the aims of the Communist infiltration of religion?

Mr. GITLOW. I think all the aims of the Communist conspiracy in religion will become clear when the complete record of this conspiracy is exposed. I would like at this time to point out one of its central aims which is almost totally ignored.

Mr. KUNZIG. Will you tell us what that is?

Mr. GITLOW. Communist infiltration of the religious field aims to undermine faith in the American system. It seeks to subvert the religious spirit on the basis of social-economic creeds and seditious politics. It strives to poison the minds of a religious people with a destructive, atheistic ideology cloaked in the name of social action and religious interpretations based upon the Bible, that the religious agents of Communist infiltration are wont to call prophetic religion.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did the Methodist Federation for Social Action serve the Communists in this purpose?

Mr. GITLOW. The record proves that the Methodist Federation for Social Action served the Communists ideally in this diabolic scheme. An examination of the findings of congressional investigations, research reports, and available historical data discloses that over 300 Methodist clergymen from all parts of the country, including some of the church's most prominent bishops, participated in Communist-

front organizations, collaborated with Communist Party leaders and with Communists who were leaders in these front organizations. The record proves how effective the Methodist Federation for Social Action was in the Methodist Church.

Mr. KUNZIG. How did the Communists operate in the Methodist Federation for Social Action?

Mr. GITLOW. The Methodist Federation for Social Action operated, though it was an unofficial organization, as if it had the official sanction of the Methodist Church. Its limited, small membership, fluctuating between 2,000 and 10,000, is dominated by a handful of Communists who never officially avowed their Communist affiliations. The Communists in the organization maintained an alliance with militant, revolutionary Socialists, who were not under Communist discipline, but who nevertheless went along with the Communists. The Communists operated within the Methodist Federation for Social Action on the premise that it was important to keep within the Methodist Federation for Social Action all the Socialist, leftist, pacifist, and the so-called liberal and progressive elements just so long as they went together with the Communists on specific issues. Behind the facade of the Methodist Federation for Social Action, the Communists posed as religious reformers fighting orthodoxy and reaction in religion.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did the Methodist Federation for Social Action exert influence on the religious field?

Mr. GITLOW. The Christian Social Action Movement which was the outgrowth of an action at the conference of ministers held in Chicago, April 1932, proves how influential the federation was on the religious field.

Mr. KUNZIG. Will you tell us what you know about that movement?

Mr. GITLOW. At the Chicago conference a Socialist Ministers Protective Association was formed to provide emergency maintenance for any member who loses his job because of social interest and activity (refer to Leaders Handbook, p. 2).

Mr. KUNZIG. What is the Leaders Handbook you just referred to?

Mr. GITLOW. It is a report of the conference held in Chicago at which the Christian Social Action Movement was launched. The Leaders Handbook includes what transpired at the conference, its decisions, and the program adopted.

Mr. KUNZIG. What did the conference held at Chicago decide?

Mr. GITLOW. Its approach to the social problems created by the depression was decidedly Marxist. The conference approved steps toward the realization of socialism. It concluded, Leaders Handbook, page 39, the following:

At the present time most of them believe that the declaration of principles and the economic aims of the Socialist Party of America most clearly coincide with these principles.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did the conference tie in Christianity with socialism?

Mr. GITLOW. It did, for on page 14 of the Leaders Handbook the following appears:

While socialism and Christianity are not identical, socialism builds up the basic principles of the Christian religion.

Mr. KUNZIG. What did the conference adopt which approached a Communist position?

Mr. GITLOW. The conference accepted the Communist class-struggle theory in the following words:

We are not closing our eyes to the fact that this dividing line between classes exists. Whether by our own choosing or not we, as ministers and church workers, are members of the privileged class. A gulf exists between us and the workers. * * * The initiative for the breakdown of that barrier rests upon us. It is an all but impossible task (Leaders Handbook, p. 23).

Mr. KUNZIG. Was that its only approach to communism?

Mr. GITLOW. Not at all. The Chicago conference stressed its opposition to capitalism, to the American system of industrialism and wealth accumulation in the sharpest terms. It took the position of the Communists that the church is an institution of class privilege serving the rich. It gave its support to communism under the guise of scientific planning, in other words, to the Soviet Communist system of planned economy which the Communists also call scientific planning.

The conference put its decision in this respect in the following words:

That we commit ourselves to the principle of an economy based upon scientific planning as opposed to the principle of laissez faire and the competition that makes for periodic chaos and conflict (Leaders Handbook, p. 34).

Mr. KUNZIG. Did the Chicago conference make a decision supporting cooperation with the Communist Party?

Mr. GITLOW. It made such a decision in principle paving the way for cooperation not only with the Communist Party, but with all organizations committed to a Marxist or Communist program. I now read the decision:

That we cooperate with all these organizations which are seeking basic changes in our economic order (Leaders Handbook, p. 33).

Mr. KUNZIG. Did the conference recognize the Methodist Federation for Social Action?

Mr. GITLOW. It did, in the following words:

That all ministers in the denominations who are willing to participate actively in the industrial conflict register with the Methodist Federation for Social Service.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did the conference adopt a policy on political action?

Mr. GITLOW. It adopted a position on the two-party system prevailing in the United States which coincided with the position of the Communist Party on this matter. The Communists have repeatedly attempted to break down the two-party system, either by the organization of a mass third party, or by the infiltration of the two major political parties. On the two-party system the conference declared:

The two existing major parties have a well-established technique for beclouding vital issues. * * * We believe that effective strategy demands an absolute refusal to compromise with candidates or parties seeking only palliative reforms to the present capitalist system (Leaders Handbook, p. 38).

Mr. KUNZIG. Did the Social Action Movement adopt a program for the infiltration of the church?

Mr. GITLOW. They called the program of infiltration "churchwide action," and the basis for the infiltration program was the following statement:

In order, however, for the ministry, in and through the church, to propagate the conviction that the capitalist order under which we live is incompatible with the goal of the Christian Church, the church and the ministry must recog-

nize the extent to which they are receiving their support through this system. There must be no curtailment of message nor compromise with the existing order for the sake of support.

Mr. KUNZIG. What kind of organization did the conference decide?

Mr. GITLOW. They decided the following:

Statewide organization should be promoted by every member of this conference and other social-action groups. The Methodist Federation for Social Service has consistently, continuously, and courageously advanced the Christian social cause. We shall cooperate in every way with the personnel and program of the federation (Leaders Handbook, p. 41).

Mr. KUNZIG. What kind of a program for local church action did the conference provide?

Mr. GITLOW. In its program for local church action it paved the way for the collaboration of the local churches with the Communist Party. Here is what the program stated:

The local church should cooperate with all those organizations which are seeking basic changes in the economic order. Official boards should be made to realize that the church building should be made available as a meeting place for such groups wherever there is a denial of free speech. Whenever there is no agency to call a meeting of protest, in the event of a violation of human rights and civil liberties, ministers and churches should take the initiative in so doing (Leaders Handbook, p. 58).

Mr. KUNZIG. Did the conference adopt an educational program?

Mr. GITLOW. It adopted an emergency educational program, which directed that—

Each pastor should do more than comfort his people; he should increase their consciousness of existing wrongs and deliberately foment and increase the discontent of the people with the intolerable conditions now existing.

Mr. KUNZIG. What kind of books were recommended in the Leaders Handbook?

Mr. GITLOW. About 25 percent of the books and pamphlets recommended in the Leaders Handbook were written by well-known members of the Communist Party, by Communist fellow travelers, and by pro-Soviet apologists and paid propagandists. Here are a few:

Labor and Textiles, by Dunn and Hardy, both authors members of the Communist Party.

Company Unions, by Dunn, R. W., author Communist.

Labor and Silk, by Grace Hutchins, Communist Party member.

Labor Fact Book, by Labor Research Association, the research department of the Communist Party.

Your Job and Your Pay, by Pollock and Tippet. Tippet was a secret member of the Communist Party.

Labor and Coal, by Anna Rochester, Communist Party member.

The Profit Motive, by Harry F. Ward.

Soviet Russia, by William Chamberlain, pro-Soviet book.

The Soviet Challenge to America, by G. S. Counts, pro-Soviet book.

The Challenge of Russia, by Sherwood Eddy, pro-Soviet.

Books by Maurice Hindus, pro-Soviet writer.

Books by S. B. Webb, British Fabian Socialist who became Communist.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is the basic program of the Methodist Federation for Social Action? By what principles is the organization guided?

Mr. GITLOW. The Crisis Leaflets, a series of 12 propaganda leaflets, published officially by the Methodist Federation for Social Action in the early 1930's, and distributed widely among Methodists throughout the country, outline the basic program and principles of the federation.

Mr. KUNZIG. Does the Methodist Federation for Social Action still adhere to the principles embodied in these leaflets?

Mr. GITLOW. The Methodist Federation for Social Action has never deviated from the basic principles and concepts embodied in the Crisis Leaflets. To my knowledge, they have never been criticized or repudiated by the federation.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do these leaflets embody the Communist position?

Mr. GITLOW. In these leaflets the federation takes the Communist position against American capitalism.

Mr. KUNZIG. Does it call for the overthrow of the American social-economic system and Government?

Mr. GITLOW. The Crisis Leaflets call for such overthrow just as the Communists do.

Mr. KUNZIG. What kind of system do they advocate should be established in the United States?

Mr. GITLOW. The leaflets advocate the establishment of a system of planned economy patterned after the system of planned economy that prevails in Communist Russia.

Mr. KUNZIG. What do the leaflets urge the American people to do?

Mr. GITLOW. The contents of the leaflets are contemptuous of the American system and Government. Through them the Methodist Federation for Social Action urges the American people to follow the examples set by the Soviet Government, the Communist dictatorship.

Mr. KUNZIG. Could you review, for this committee, the contents of the Crisis Leaflets?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes. I have prepared a synopsis of the leaflets, and with your indulgence, I will now read it.

Crisis Leaflet No. 1—Do You Know What Has Happened?

This leaflet presents the Communist position on capitalism as follows:

The profit system has broken down. You have grown up with the thought that, like God and the Constitution, it can't be changed. * * * A page of history has been turned. The country which has insisted that it would be saved by private initiative has now recognized that the day of private capitalism has gone.

The same idea is contained in the Daily Worker editorial of January 30, 1933, in which the Communist position is stated as follows:

Capitalism is declining. Every day adds large numbers of recruits to the gigantic army of working people who are losing or have already lost all faith and hope in capitalism.

The position of the federation as expressed in these leaflets that "the day of private capitalism has gone" is the position of the Communist Party.

Crisis Leaflets No. 2—Do You Want Fascism?

In leaflet No. 2 the Methodist Federation for Social Action follows the Communist Party line when the Communist Party opposed the New Deal and its National Recovery Administration as fascism.

The leaflet declares:

We will do what fascism does in Italy and Germany * * * using the power of the State to try to save the profit system after it has broken down.

The leaflet actually uses the language of the Communist Daily Worker in attacking the NRA. I quote from the leaflet:

NRA machinery is being used to send strikers back to work without guaranteeing them that they get justice. It is not being used to prevent the use of tear-gas bombs and policemen's clubs against them. * * * We lynch people, especially Negroes. We club Reds and throw them into jail. * * * When our situation gets worse we'll transfer the blame to the Communists and the Jews, as they are doing in Germany and persecute them. * * * Would you be willing to do that to save your job? Your religion says, "No." * * * This is a heavy price to save the capitalist system. * * * Can the system be saved anyway?

That the above quotation from the leaflet published by the Methodist Federation for Social Action parallels the Communist Party line is clear from the resolution of the 16th Central Committee Plenum of the Communist Party published in the Daily Worker of February 18, 1933, which puts the Communist position as follows:

The capitalist dictatorship of the United States attempts to meet its growing difficulties of deeper economic crisis and growing resistance of the toiling masses both by means of resort to demagoguery and a definite movement toward the fascization of the state.

Leaflet No. 2 contends, as the Communists do, that the exposure of the Communists is an attack upon the liberties of all the people by the United States Government and that the United States is already employing Fascist methods, in its attempt to save the broken-down economic system of capitalism.

Crisis Leaflet No. 3—Can the Profit System Be Saved?

This leaflet attempts to prove the Communist contention that the capitalist system is like a broken-down old car that the mechanic tells you it does not pay to repair. That is what the Communists tell us:

Junk the rotten old system and get a new model, communism, f. o. b., Moscow.

The leaflet concludes, by asking the question:

Isn't it cheaper to get a new economic order?

Crisis Leaflet No. 4—No Way Out.

In this leaflet the Methodist Federation for Social Action tells the American people there is no hope for them under the present American system. It tells them categorically that they will get—

More war, less education, lower standards of living, less security—there is no way out under the profit system.

The logical alternative left to the American people if they follow the advice contained in Crisis Leaflets 3 and 4, is to get rid of the system and the United States Government which seeks by Fascist methods to save it. It is such things that aid the ideological line of the Communist Party, which seeks to overthrow our system and the Government.

Crisis Leaflet No. 5—Why Is There No Way Out Under the Profit System?

In this leaflet the Methodist Federation for Social Action presents a Marxist-Communist criticism of our economic system, warning the American people that under the prevailing American social-economic system they can do nothing to improve conditions for themselves. The

leaflet aims to develop in the mind of an American, who reads it, a mood of pessimism and hopelessness. It presents the Communist position that capitalism, the profit system, is bankrupt and the American people are doomed if they depend upon it in the future.

Crisis Leaflet No. 6—Do You Want These Things?

In this leaflet the Methodist Federation for Social Action charges that the American economic system, in order to keep alive, uses the state, the United States Government, to destroy freedom and democracy. It concludes that the American people—

Must get some better way of doing the work of the world than the profit system.

The Methodist Federation, therefore, goes much further than just advocating the destruction of the American economic system and the Government that sustains it; the federation actually calls for doing the work of the world some other way. The federation's program is definitely, besides being a program for America, an international program of action against the existing order. That is what the Communists advocate and they call their program a program for world revolution.

Crisis leaflet No. 7—A Planned Economy.

The leaflet asks:

What better way of doing the work of the world is available?

It gives the answer as follows:

A planned economy.

That the Methodist Federation for Social Action advocates the adoption of a planned economy patterned after the Communist "5-year plan" is made clear when the leaflet explains:

Then it measures our total capacities to supply these needs and adjusts these 2 in a 5-year plan.

Crisis leaflet No. 8—Plenty for All.

The leaflet catalogs the benefits the American people will get under planned economy in these words:

We won't go short of food—none need go in rags—none must live in slums and country shacks—all can have medical attention—all may play—none need be denied an education.

The Methodist Federation for Social Action ignores the fact that these benefits have been enjoyed by the American people to a much greater degree than they have by people in other countries, thanks to the American system. In the Soviet Union, under the Communist-planned economy which the federation advocates, the people have so far failed to get the benefits which the federation promises the Americans will get under the Soviet system. This fact the federation, speaking in the name of religion and Christianity, refuses to recognize. Instead, it advocates a revolutionary program for the overthrow of our system in these words:

But to get these things we must get rid of the profit system and start social-economic planning.

Crisis leaflet No. 9—Security for All.

In this leaflet the Methodist Federation for Social Action tells the American people that if they want work, no unemployment, and real

security they should do what the Communists have done in Russia. The federation is emphatic on this point, for the leaflet stresses:

The only country that has a complete social-economic plan is the Soviet Union, and they have no unemployment.

Crisis leaflet No. 10—What Does It Cost?

In this leaflet the Methodist Federation for Social Action goes on to prove how social-economic planning, which it approves, will reduce all people to the same economic level. The leaflet states:

The maximum and the minimum will be moving toward each other. * * * This road leads to the classless society.

That is the Communist claim stated in almost the precise words they say when the Communists assert that communism leads to the classless society.

Crisis leaflet No. 11—Property for All.

Only an organization committed to a Communist program could issue such a leaflet. In this leaflet the Methodist Federation for Social Action eschews the concept of the accumulation of private property by the individual. When the leaflet speaks of "private property for all," it defines the term as social ownership. Under social ownership the leaflet states the people own more property, not less, because they own the property in common.

Under the Soviet type of planned economy advocated by the federation, the state, administered only by the Communists, owns all the property. The individual owns nothing and has no rights in such property. This the federation approves as common ownership and claims is not government ownership, which the federation opposes, for the leaflet states:

Government enterprises are run by the politicians and not by the people.

In the opinion of the federation, only when the government is a Communist dictatorship, run only by Communist politicians, do government enterprises become social ownership by all the people. The federation's position on social ownership coincides with the perverted logic the Communists use in describing their system of social ownership in a classless society.

Crisis leaflet No. 12—freedom for all.

In this leaflet the Methodist Federation for Social Action comes out in favor of a government patterned after the Communist dictatorship in Russia. It describes American freedom in these terms:

You think that social-economic planning means that you will be goosestepped by a bureaucracy and bossed by a few experts. That, an American idea, a queer one for a "land of freedom." It is here because the American people have been run so long by big bosses. They do not do it that way in the one country that has big-scale economic planning—the Soviet Union. There the social economic plan is the work of millions.

From this quotation from Crisis leaflet No. 12, it is clear that the Methodist Federation for Social Action prefers the Soviet Union and its Communist system of government to the Government of the United States under which we live. It prefers the totalitarian Communist police state, with its terror and slave-labor camps, a system of statism in which individual liberty is unknown, to the freedom the American people enjoy under the American system of government.

The Crisis leaflets prove that the Methodist Federation for Social Action is an organization committed to a Communist program. But

it is much more than that. It is one of the most important organizations operating on the religious field, which serves as an effective vehicle for the Communist infiltration of religion.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you examined the official publications of the Methodist Federation for Social Action?

Mr. GITLOW. I have. The Social Questions Bulletin.

Mr. KUNZIG. What does your examination of the Social Questions Bulletin show?

Mr. GITLOW. It shows that the Methodist Federation for Social Action has consistently followed the line of the Communist Party. It is true that in the columns of the Social Questions Bulletin there has appeared, on several occasions, some criticism of the Soviet Government. These criticisms which appeared, on rare occasions, were balanced off in the same issue, mostly in the same article, with a preponderance of praise for the Soviet Government. It was included in the Social Questions Bulletin as a protective covering of its pro-Soviet leanings, and to enable the Communist leaders of the federation and the Communist Party to claim that the federation was an impartial, non-Communist organization of religious reformers.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you prepared an analysis of copies of the Social Questions Bulletins?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, I have, covering the issues from 1941 to date.

Mr. KUNZIG. Can you give us that analysis?

Mr. GITLOW. Gladly.

ANALYSIS: SOCIAL QUESTIONS BULLETINS

Social Question Bulletin, October 1941:

In his article, The Methodist Federation for Social Action Program for 1941-42, Dr. Harry F. Ward cleverly skirts around the war question created by the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union. During the period of the Soviet-Nazi alliance, Ward and the federation, following the Communist Party line, attacked the war as an imperialist war. The federation insisted, as did the Communist Party, that the United States maintain a position of strict neutrality and should under no circumstances give aid to Britain and her allies. The pacifists in the federation supported this point of view.

The Communist Party of the United States immediately changed its line on the war when Hitler's armies invaded the Soviet Union. Dr. Ward and the Communist leaders who controlled the federation, immediately switched from an antiwar position into a position that supported the line of the Communist Party.

But the war question threatened, should it be raised in the Methodist Federation for Social Action, to split the organization. The Communist leaders of the federation realized that the pacifists in the organization would not go along with a policy of supporting the war.

The Communists in control of the federation were of the opinion that the interests of the Communist Party could not be served effectively if the federation were to be split on the war question. Dr. Ward, in his article, explained the position of the Communists on this question, as follows:

The answer is that the new relations of Great Britain and the United States with the Soviet Union in no way touch the grounds on which we reached the decision to put the war question outside the scope of our program * * *. The

differences between us on this issue are such that the attempt to commit the organization to any position would reduce it to a small group.

Dr. Ward states why it was necessary to avoid taking a position on the war question, a position which he knew would expose the members of the Communist cell in control of the federation. In his opinion the federation must not take a position on the war question that would align the Communists in the federation against the pacifist and antiwar clergymen in the organizations. He gives his reasons as follows:

During the past year, at points where the foundations of our democracy have been threatened, there has been strong united resistance by preachers who differ widely concerning war. A statement to the President and Congress concerning attempts to outlaw the Communist Party, the forerunner in Europe to the abolition of all democratic procedure, was signed by more preachers than any other group, except labor leaders.

The reasons of Dr. Ward prove that the Communist Party held that when preachers, in large numbers, were ready to defend the Communist Party when it was under attack, it would be a serious mistake to alienate their support over temporary disagreements on the war question.

Dr. Ward admits that the preachers were very important to the Communist Party in its fronts. He admits:

Preachers led in signatures to the statement of principles of academic freedom put out by the Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, in recent attempts to Hitlerize our educational system.

The Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom was a Communist-front organization. Dr. Ward, in his article, proves that preachers in many Communist-front organizations constituted the backbone of the organization, and that they played an important role in supporting Communist fronts.

Dealing with the federation's programmatic position on the defense of democratic rights, Dr. Ward states:

The next question thus naturally introduced is, What is the bearing of the new relations between the great capitalist democracies and the first Socialist state upon the first point in our program which is defense of democratic rights and, specifically, the rights of minority political groups, of labor, of conscientious objects?

The federation's position on democratic rights, in the words of Dr. Ward, is to defend specifically the rights of minority political groups; namely, the rights of the Moscow controlled and directed Communist Party of the United States. The federation's program parallels the position of the Communist Party which maintains that an attack upon democratic rights.

In analyzing the federation's program, Dr. Ward holds that the ascendancy of the capitalist elements in the United States, that decreed the destruction of Spanish democracy—it happens to be the official Communist position—were responsible for the outbreak of World War II. Never once does he mention the role played by the Soviet-Nazi pact in starting World War II.

Dr. Ward further maintains that the war, with Soviet Russia now on the side of the Western democracies, had driven these forces to cover. That for these reactionary capitalist elements:

Democracy is only a political form to be used to aid capitalism, to be smashed when it becomes a means to change the economic order and achieve a nobler way of life in continuous realization of the Christian ideal.

In his article laying down the program the federation should follow, Dr. Ward joins the Communists in attacking Congress, the Justice Department, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the President while he defends the Communist Party, Harry Bridges, west coast Communist leaders, and Earl Browder, then general secretary of the Communist Party.

Dr. Ward underscores the ultimate goal of the program of the Methodist Federation for Social Action in his article, *Outline of a Christian Program for Social Change*, in the following words:

The attempt of Roosevelt and Churchill to answer him (Stalin) with a statement of the democratic order for which the Allies are fighting gives us only high-sounding trite and vague generalities. * * * The moment war ends, democratic imperialism will gather its full force to extend its investment opportunities and controls. * * * The underlying antagonism between capitalist and socialist society will begin to operate. * * * In various European nations the fight for freedom will turn into revolutionary struggles to achieve not merely self-government, but a really democratic economic and social order. We have rejected the profit-seeking economy because it is increasingly the destroyer of society as well as the ideals of our religion. * * * We know that the people of the capitalist democracies are living in the city of destruction. We see the way to the city of life.

Since the United States is a capitalist democracy its people live in the city of destruction. In Dr. Ward's opinion the Methodist Federation which seeks the destruction of our profit-making economy in favor of so-called planned economy of communism, sees the way to the city of life. That is the essence of the federation's Christian program for social change.

In the *Social Questions Bulletin* of October 1942, Rev. Charles C. Webber, in his article, *Now and the Post War*, unequivocally endorses communism as it operates in the Soviet Union.

Reverend Webber calls upon the people of the United Nations—

To further develop and perfect the socialization and democratization of the basic industries and banking.

Reverend Webber explains how this should be done, as follows:

The experience of the people of the Soviet Union in dealing with this problem should be carefully examined and utilized in a constructive manner.

Reverend Webber leaves no doubt that he wants the people of the world to emulate what has taken place in the Soviet Union. Reverend Webber's appeal is an appeal for the socialization of the world on the Soviet basis. He wrote his appeal when he was the executive secretary of the federation.

In the same issue of the *Social Questions Bulletin*, an item from an article written by Bishop Francis J. McConnell on monopoly is used as an introduction to an article in the bulletin also on monopoly. The article on monopoly is a page and a half reprint from a pamphlet, *Monopoly in the United States*, published by the Labor Research Association, 80 East 11th Street, New York City. The Labor Research Association is the official research department of the Communist Party. Its director, Robert W. Dunn, is an important figure in the Communist infiltration of religion, a secret member of the Communist Party and a Soviet agent.

The straight Communist position of this pamphlet was published in the bulletin. The address of the Labor Research Association was also given. In fact, during Bishop McConnell's presidency of the Metho-

dist Federation of Social Action and up to the present time, the Federation has continuously used the material supplied by Dunn's Communist Party research organization and recommends and distributes its material.

Social Questions Bulletin, April 1943:

Almost the entire issue, 3 pages out of 4, is devoted to an article, Understanding the Soviet Union, by Harry F. Ward.

Dr. Ward wrote an endorsement and highly exaggerated laudation of the Soviet Union. The space devoted to this article indicated that it met with the approval of the federation.

Dr. Ward denies the Soviet Union is totalitarian in these words:

In this situation the fact that there is only one party in the Soviet Union does not make the state totalitarian. The Soviet Communist Party is not a political party in our sense of the term. It is a leadership organization.

So did Hitler call his Nazi Party a leadership organization, and like the Communist Party in the Soviet Union, it was the only party permitted to operate in Germany. Nevertheless, Dr. Ward, secretary and foremost leader of the Methodist Federation for Social Action, a professor of Christian ethics who never disavowed his religiosity approves the "fuehrer concept" of totalitarianism as practiced by the Communist Party in Russia. He actually went much farther in his article for he justified the antireligious stand of the Soviet Government and the atheistic, antireligious activities of the Communists in these carefully selected and significant words:

That part of the society's campaign which battled for science against religious obscurantism is won.

Dr. Ward refers to the Society of the Godless through which the Communists of Russia conducted their atheistic campaign. He approves its activity as a battle for science against religious obscurantism.

The items recommended in this issue of the bulletin for further reading on the Soviet Union proves conclusively that the federation is pro-Soviet for not one book critical of the Soviet Union is recommended. I will list them—

The Soviet Union, by Hewlett Johnson: Johnson is a member of the Communist Party of Great Britain, a paid Soviet propagandist known as the Red Dean of Canterbury. His books are straight Soviet propaganda containing the material supplied to him by the Agitprop Department of the Comintern, the Russian Communist Party, and the Foreign Office of the Soviet Union. The Communist Party of the United States conducted a campaign to distribute 1 million copies of his book. The federation recommends it.

The Soviets Expected It, by Anna Louise Strong: The author was a member of the Communist Party from the early twenties. She was a paid Soviet agent and propagandist employed by the Foreign Office of the Soviet Government. She was editor of Soviet Government publications printed in the English language. She also served as a Soviet spy in many countries.

In Place of Profit, by Dr. Harry F. Ward: Dr. Ward presents a highly colored, pro-Communist picture of the Soviet Union.

The Soviets, by Albert Rhys Williams, a Soviet Government paid agent and propagandist.

Russia At War, published by the American Russian Institute, a Communist-front organization, organized, controlled, and run by the Communist Party.

Soviet Russia Today, a monthly magazine published by the Friends of the Soviet Union, an organization set up by the Communist Party with the approval of the Soviet Government. Its editors were selected by the political committee of the Communist Party.

The Social Questions Bulletin of April 1943, the official publication of the Methodist Federation for Social Action recommended these books on Communist Russia and no others.

The editorial on page 4 of this issue approves the acquisition by the Soviet Union of the Baltic States including Poland, Karelia, and Bessarabia, and justifies the enslavement of peoples of these countries under the iron heel of communism, in these words:

Is democracy a set of political forms which enables capitalists, landlords, and their political dependents to hold the substance of power—as in the poll-tax States; or is it the overwhelming majority of the people—the European countries in question, peasants, and workers, taking democratic power themselves?

But the people did not take over the substance of power in these countries. It was the Red army that put the Communist stooges of the Soviet Union in power in these countries. The official bulletin of the federation distorts the facts as the Communists do in order to approve Communist seizure of these countries.

Social Questions Bulletin, May 1943:

Dorothy McConnell, who contributes an article to this issue under the title of "War and the Status of Women," has a long record of Communist-front affiliations. She was on the administrative staff of the American League Against War and Fascism and the American League for Peace and Democracy. She headed the women's department of both organizations. She was a member of the executive committee of the China Aid Council, a Communist-front organization which supported and worked for the Chinese Communists. Dorothy McConnell was also on the editorial board of Women Today, official publication of the Women's Commission of the Communist Party. With her on the editorial board were such well-known Communists as Grace Lumpkin, Grace Hutchins, and Margaret Cowl. Margaret Undjus, alias Margaret Cowl, a graduate of the Lenin School Moscow, a Communist international agent, a high official of the Communist Party, today is in charge of distributing Communist propaganda material throughout the United States from the Soviet Union, Red China, and the Communist satellite countries. The rest of the members of the editorial board of this official Communist Party magazine were all members of the Communist Party. It, therefore, must be presumed that Miss McConnell was also a member of the Communist Party, because only members of the Communist Party are permitted to serve on the editorial boards of official Communist Party publications. The managing editor of Today was Isobel Walker Soule, a member of the Women's Commission of the Communist Party.

The issue also carries an editorial in defense of Goodwin Watson, a Methodist minister and former professor of Teachers College, Columbia University, captioned "Democracy Via Martin Dies." Dr. Watson was held unfit to continue in the employ of the Government as Chief Analyst of the Foreign Intelligence Service of the Federal Communi-

cations Commission because of his record in the sponsoring of Communist-front organizations. (Social Questions Bulletin, November 1943.)

Dr. William B. Spofford, in his article, *Revolution by Consent*, which takes up 2½ pages of the Bulletin, comes out in full support of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party position. There can be no doubt that Spofford's views are endorsed by the Methodist Federation for Social Action. Dr. Spofford's close collaboration with the federation and its leadership extends from the early 1930's to date. Dr. Spofford's support of the Communist Party, his affiliation with and sponsorship of Communist and Communist-front organizations covers over 30 organizations. He is cited over 50 times by the House Committee on Un-American Activities for his pro-Communist activities. He defended the Communist Party, acted on committees to free Earl Browder, sponsored the American Youth for Democracy, the successor to the Young Communist League, and signed a statement, together with Dr. Ward, during the Soviet-Nazi pact defending the Communist Party.

At a mock trial staged by the Communist Party in its campaign against the House committee, Dr. Spofford appeared as a witness to present the religious side of the case. Practically all the witnesses presented by the Communist Party at this mock trial were members of the Communist Party.

Dr. Spofford's connection with the People's Institute of Applied Religion, exposed as a vicious Communist organization for the infiltration of the religious field, points up the insidious role Dr. Spofford plays in the religious and social life of America. But Dr. Spofford, a member of the international board of directors of the People's Institute of Applied Religion, was not alone in his sponsorship of this Communist organization on the religious field. The director of the People's Institute of Applied Religion, Claude C. Williams, a member of the Communist Party, has a notorious record in connection with the Communist Party's infiltration activities. The close affinity of the Methodist Federation for Social Service with this Communist organization is established by the fact that the federation's outstanding leaders were among its sponsors; namely, Dr. Harry F. Ward, Jack McMichael, Rev. Willard E. Uphaus, and the Reverend Charles C. Webber.

In his article for the federation's bulletin, Dr. Spofford identifies the socialism he firmly believes in with what he saw in the Soviet Union. He writes:

The basis of this confidence in socialism; even in short visits to four Soviet cities, a few collective farms and factories, I could see it made a nation and its people strong and determined and believing.

Dr. Spofford holds that socialism is synonymous with religion. He expresses this credo, as follows:

For a clergyman to declare his belief in socialism—certainly if he works at it, inevitably lays him open to the charge of being secular. The reverse is the truth for our day; not to believe in socialism is to be secular.

The conclusion that must be drawn from Dr. Spofford's affirmation of faith is that, to be religious and a Christian, one must be a Socialist, and preferably one who believes in the Communist socialism prevailing in the Soviet Union.

He presents his position, typically that of the Methodist Federation for Social Action, as follows:

There are two struggles going on today. One is the struggle between the United Nations and the Axis Powers. It is easy for us to know where we line up in this fight. There is also a worldwide struggle between those who believe that the machine technique and our ability to produce shall unite the nations in a cooperative society (Communist Society BG) that will eventually end poverty, classes, and war, and those who are determined to maintain privilege and power even if it means slavery, the scrapping of democracy, Fascism, and a third world war. And as I read and meet people I find them, in the last analysis, oriented toward either Berlin or Moscow. Those who want men, machines, and materials used to produce goods for human needs look to Moscow as standing for this supremely.

Dr. Spofford accepts the Communist position that the forces of the world are divided into two camps: the capitalist, the reactionary forces moving in the direction of fascism; the other, the progressive forces moving in the direction of communism, to the center of world Communist power—Moscow. Dr. Spofford, like all Communists do, accepts the world leadership of Moscow.

Such a position necessarily leads the one who holds it into the service of Moscow. If Moscow stands supremely, as Dr. Spofford puts it, for everything good in the world, then it follows logically that Dr. Spofford must support the interests of the Soviet Union. If the leaders of the Methodist Federation for Social Action did not believe as Dr. Spofford does about Moscow being the center of attraction of the forces for good in the world, they would not devote so much space in their bulletins for espousing the cause of Communist Russia. The federation believes that Moscow is the center of attraction for the new world they hope to help build, even though, at times, a little squeak to the contrary is permitted to find expression in its official publication.

Dr. Spofford, as an American and a Christian, hopes to get his Communist revolution by consent. If the American people refuse to follow Dr. Spofford's advice and do not consent to commit suicide by abandoning freedom and accepting communism, then Dr. Spofford threatens them:

That the forces at work in this world will lead to revolution through violence.

That Dr. Spofford's article, in the November 1943 Social Questions Bulletin, represented the thinking of the leaders of the Methodist Federation for Social Action, is strikingly brought out in the article by Harry F. Ward, *Are We Winning the Peace?* in the December 1943 issue of the bulletin. Its opening paragraph states:

Recent events, particularly the decisions of the Moscow Conference and those already agreed upon by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Conference are changing the trend. Internationally, the outline of tomorrow moves in the direction of democracy.

A Soviet delegate, a Communist, was the chairman of the United Nations Relief Conference, Dr. Ward refers to. At this Conference a program for relief was adopted which set goals of phantasmic utopian proportions. The Conference expected the United States to foot the bill almost in its entirety. The Conference decided that the Communist countries were to receive a large share of the relief furnished. That is why Dr. Ward enthusiastically supported that relief program.

Because the Moscow Conference decisions were hailed by the Communist Party as a great victory for the forces of democracy, as they interpreted it, meaning that the forces of democracy centered around Moscow, Dr. Ward followed suit by hailing its decisions as a trend internationally in the direction of democracy—Communist style.

Hence, Dr. Ward views opposition to the declaration of the Moscow Conference as anti-Soviet. He brings to the support of his position the pro-Soviet, pro-Communist PM, and In Fact, a newsletter widely distributed by the Communist Party.

Dr. Ward, like Dr. Spofford, sees the world picture as a struggle between Moscow and fascism. Dr. Ward, however, is much more subtle in expressing his views, in veiling its Communist intent. His words, therefore, on suspecting Americans, are much more effective. For example, he writes:

We cannot expect to maintain effective collaboration with the Soviet Union, nor to have assurance for a durable peace unless, instead of sacrificing people to investment interests, some of these are now abandoned in the interests of the people. This means that we have to deal effectively with the supporters and the sources of fascism in our land. Unless we do this we cannot win the peace * * * The propaganda to preserve free enterprise, through which monopoly enterprise seeks to get control of the postwar world, is dominating our legislation * * * That just as certainly means that our native fascism comes to power and with it the certainty of more wars. Therefore, the question of whether we can enlarge the Moscow prospect for winning the peace is again the question of whether we can defeat our own potential Fascists.

Accordingly, if we believe Dr. Ward, who more than any other person expresses the views of the Methodist Federation for Social Action, the United States representing free enterprise and investment interests is the source of reaction, fascism, and war. On the other hand, the Soviet Union, representing communism, is the source of progress, democracy, and peace.

Social Questions Bulletin, January 1944:

In this issue of the bulletin appears an official statement of the Methodist Federation for Social Action, captioned, "Stop Inflation." In its declaration on inflation the federation follows the identical line laid down in the articles, previously considered, written by Dr. Spofford and Dr. Ward. The Methodist Federation for Social Action holds that:

Unless the Fascist tendencies in our national life can be checked we will win the war overseas only to find ourselves under a modified form of fascism at home.

That is the line of the Communist Party as expressed in its 1945 national-convention resolution. It reads as follows:

If the reactionary policy and the forces of monopoly capital are not checked and defeated, America and the world will be confronted with new aggressions and wars and the growth of reaction and fascism in the United States.

Both the Communist Party and the Methodist Federation for Social Service see a future of wars and the growth of fascism at home.

The federation's declaration on inflation outlines a program that is based upon the conclusions of the Communists. It endorses the position of the National Committee To Keep Prices Down, a Communist front, and the stand of the National Farmers Union, a farmers' organization dominated and controlled by the Communist Party. It advocated the Communist Party demands calling for the enforcement by the Government of overall price controls on consumer goods.

rents, and raw materials, for increased confiscatory taxes, rationing, and low profits.

The federation's declaration on inflation states:

They are saturated with the profit psychology spread by popular farm journals owned by reactionary business interests for the purpose of pushing the program of the National Association of Manufacturers and keeping the farmers from uniting with labor and white-collar progressives.

The unity of the farmers, with labor and the white-collar progressives, is just what the Communist Party advocates in its fight against the profit system.

The federation's declaration on inflation holds that—

The profit motive is as limiting to reform measures as it is hostile to the spirit of religion.

Eugene Dennis, the general secretary of the Communist Party, in his report to the Plenum of the National Committee of the Communist Party in 1946, made the same charges. He said:

Simultaneously with the drive to enact repressive antiunion legislation, and thereby to weaken all democratic forces, the big corporations, spearheaded by the National Association of Manufacturers and its bipartisan congressional coalition, renewed their attacks against the living standards of the workers and all salaried and low-income groups.

The federation's declaration on inflation asks:

But what about the inflationary pressure of incomes above the \$3,000, in creating black-market prices and getting luxury goods produced instead of cheaper, more durable kinds? What about the inflationary results of failing to tax these higher incomes for the costs of the subsidies to keep prices down?

Then the declaration concludes:

Taxation is the final decisive point of the battle of inflation. It is the only way to remove the inflationary power of unspendable income.

The Methodist Federation program on taxation as a measure to fight inflation is a confiscatory measure for wiping out the savings and reducing the incomes of the great bulk of the American people who earn \$3,000 or more a year. Such taxation would impoverish the American people, make unavoidable national bankruptcy and statism, and create a situation exceedingly favorable for the growth of communism.

Social Questions Bulletin, February 1944:

In this issue the program of the Methodist Federation for Social Action for full employment is presented under the title "Secure Full Employment." The demand for full employment was first raised by the Communist Party.

The federation's declaration for full employment states:

The present situation shows that the profit economy can never provide the creative employment and abundant living which is both the goal of religion and labor.

Let us see how this statement jibes with the Communist position on full employment. In the January 1946 issue of Political Affairs, the theoretical magazine of the Communist Party, Alexander Bittelman, in different words, repeats what the Methodist Federation for Social Action holds, in these words:

Mass unemployment under capitalism is no accident, nor is it a passing misfortune. * * * Only under a Socialist system can full employment be realized as a permanent and stable institution.

The only difference between the two statements is that Bittelman, the theoretician of the Communist Party, states positively what the declaration of the Methodist Federation for Social Action states negatively. If the profit economy, as the federation states, cannot provide full employment, then it is logical to assume that the system which rejects the profit motive—the Socialist system—can. There is, therefore, no disagreement on the question of full employment, obtainable only under a system of socialism, between the Communist Party and the Methodist Federation for Social Service.

Social Questions Bulletin, March 1944:

In this issue appears the third of the programmatic declarations of the Methodist Federation for Social Action under the caption "Defeat Free-Enterprise Propaganda." The declaration starting with the Communist position on our economic order states that propaganda on behalf of free enterprise—

Is the total expression of a declining economy trying to postpone the day when it must give way to another with the vigor of youth.

The federation in its declaration expresses almost identically what was stated in the memorandum of the labor committee of the Communist Party dealing with the question of free enterprise. Issued in 1945, it proclaimed:

Now it is clear that private enterprise has failed.

Starting from that premise, the declaration of the federation emphasized:

Our task is to get a democratic not a Fascist state capitalism.

Democratic state capitalism is what the Communists call their system of socialism during the period of its transition into communism. Lenin used the term "state capitalism" to describe the system in the Soviet Union and so did Stalin. The ultimate goal, therefore, of the Methodist Federation for Social Action is the attainment of democratic state capitalism as described by the Communists—the system in force in Russia under Communist rule.

Crisis Bulletin, April 1944:

In this issue the statement of Dr. George A. Coe on the future of the Methodist Federation for Social Action is important because of Dr. Coe's tremendous influence on Dr. Ward. Coe may be considered the sage of the federation, its idealistic and spiritual mentor. Dr. Ward is its dynamic political leader and organizer, the watchdog of the Communist Party and the Soviet Union in the organization.

When Dr. Coe died Dr. Ward wrote in the December 1951 issue of the Bulletin the following eulogy:

To this man I owe much, first as his student and later his colleague. In more than 50 years of friendship we worked and counseled together. * * * Last year he wrote: "I have known only a few of my Christian friends to recognize the truth that what is splitting the world is the ethical core of Marxism, not the political system that has developed in Russia. * * * This ethical core of Marxism is being ignored by both the political and the ecclesiastical thought that is most characteristic of the United States today.

There can be no doubt that the Marxist philosophy dominated the beliefs and thinking of both Dr. Coe and Dr. Ward. So did Dr. Coe, as Dr. Ward has repeatedly proven, over a lifetime accept and support

the political expression of Marxism, concretely—the Communist dictatorship, the Soviet Union.

In his statement on the future of the Methodist Federation for Social Action he wrote:

The present war, whatever be the formal terms of peace, will create the greatest opportunity in all history for the spread and deepening of the movement for democracy. The leader in this movement, at points where the issues are crucially ethical, is Russia, today the moral leader of the world.

What more glowing endorsement and support could be given to the brutal Communist dictatorship than to call it the moral leader of the world?

But Dr. Coe, in his directives to the Methodist Federation for Social Action, went much further in his tribute to Communist Russia. He wrote:

For the first time in history a whole people has moved with determination toward the only kind of society in which the actual nature of man can express itself. * * * If the Methodist Federation for Social Action desires to go forward with the work that it has already ably begun, here is the direction in which it can perform its greatest service.

The record will show that the Methodist Federation for Social Action has performed its greatest service, through the infiltration of the religious field, in the direction of Marxism and its political expression, the Communist Party, and the Soviet Union. The Methodist Federation for Social Action is bound to reflect, both ideologically and in action on the religious field, the views entertained by its outstanding leaders. Dr. Coe was a most outstanding and respected leader of the federation. His words always carried weight, and his directives were carried out.

Social Questions Bulletin, June 1944:

In this issue appears the authorized declaration of the Methodist Federation for Social Action, under the title of, "Extend Democracy." The Communist and Soviet orientation of the federation is clearly defined in this declaration. The declaration reads:

What is democracy? We need to remember that the use of democratic forms to protect things as they are has put the world where it is now. That is why the Germans got Hitler and gave him to the world.

The declaration simply restates the Communist position on our form of democracy; namely, that it is a cloak for reaction and fascism. The logic of the federation's position is understandable from the Communist standpoint for if we stick to our democratic forms, the Constitution, Bill of Rights, representative government, and multiple party system, we will get fascism in the United States and an American Hitler.

That the Methodist Federation for Social Action accepts the Communist interpretation of historical events is demonstrated when the declaration continues:

When Russia went socialist under a Communist leadership we changed our position and in due time, the Baltic States got Fascist control under democratic forms. Now they have voted by overwhelming majorities to go into the Soviet Union and have been received as autonomous republics.

That the people of the Baltic republics were forced to vote for inclusion into the Soviet Union dictatorship by the bayonets of the Red army which occupied their territories is simply ignored by the

federation in rushing to approve the expansion of the Communist empire to the Baltic Sea.

Social Questions Bulletin, October 1944:

In this issue of the Bulletin, Dr. Harry F. Ward and Rev. Alson J. Smith gave their views on what kind of an organization the Methodist Federation for Social Action should be. Their views are important because they establish the fact that the federation is a dynamic militant organization opposed to the American economic system, that its objectives are to emulate in the United States, the Soviet Government, to support the issues raised by the Communist Party and that it has been organized especially for the infiltration of the church, its press, seminaries, educational, youth, and women's organizations. Dr. Ward and Reverend Smith indicate how the Communists use the federation in the field of religion for the objectives of the Communist Party and the Soviet Union.

Writing on, *The Tasks Before Us*, Dr. Ward states:

But we have been and are a vital fellowship, composed of those who are convinced that the dominant driving principles of our economic order are contrary to the ethics of the gospel.

According to Dr. Ward, the vital, the driving force in the federation are those who are positive in their opposition to the dominant principles of the American economic order. These, in Dr. Ward's mind, represent the hard core, the Marxists, the Communists in the federation—

those who see the general direction in which the changes required by the gospel should move.

These people (the Communist hard core in the Federation-BG)—
says Dr. Ward—

are joined by a considerable number who are not yet sure of these things but who desire to abolish economic injustice and wish a thorough discussion of the underlying issues.

Herein, Dr. Ward outlines the Communist strategy of the united front. The Communists forming the hard core are surrounded by those who are not yet ready to follow an out and out Communist program unit on underlying, specific issues. The Communists use these elements as a cloak to hide their real intentions and seek through discussions and classes in communism to convert as large a segment of this element to their point of view.

That Dr. Ward wants the federation to be an unofficial agency outside of the pale of the church, yet in it, an organization not responsible or subject to the discipline of the church, so that it can have a free hand to carry on its insidious Communist infiltration activities, is manifest in his conclusions, which read as follows:

Surely all those who are seekers for a more Christian social order, including those who are not yet sure of the way to it, will support this work, which in the nature of the case, as the experience of other denominations shows, cannot be done by an official agency, no matter how progressive its staff.

The practical program for the infiltration of religion is outlined by Rev. Alson J. Smith, as follows:

(a) Education * * * creation of a speakers bureau; through bulletins on timely subjects * * * with specific recommendations for action and through articles in the church and secular press.

(b) Organization * * * The setting up of MFSS units or branches in all annual conferences and in theological seminaries, as well as in local churches where that is possible. These units should be the action arm of the federation in local churches, conferences, and seminaries.

Rev. Alson J. Smith also advocates as part of the program of the Methodist Federation for Social Action:

Churchwide education is needed to promote understanding of the aims and methods of the Soviet Union.

That is why Reverend Smith wants the federation to be a separate and independent organization (in this he agrees with the position of Dr. Ward), characterized by militancy and immediacy and he concludes:

We do not have time to trust entirely to the long, slow, educative process.

Social Questions Bulletin, December 1944:

The bulletin announced that on December 2, 1944, the executive committee of the Methodist Federation for Social Action unanimously elected the Rev. Jack Richard McMichael, executive secretary of the federation. At this meeting of the executive committee, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam was elected a vice president of the federation and a member of its administrative committee. The statement of the administrative committee on Reverend McMichael's election to the most important post in the federation, gives a brief biographical sketch of the young minister, who was not yet 30 years old, in which mention of his numerous activities as a leader and sponsor of Communist fronts is left out entirely. An examination of Reverend McMichael's record will show him up as an important member of the Young Communist League and the Communist Party. His Communist loyalties and activities were well known when he became the unanimous choice for the federation's top administrative, organizing, and political orientation job. It indicates what a firm grip the Communist cell in the federation had on the organization.

The same issue of the bulletin contains an article by Prof. Amey Hews, who signed a Communist petition seeking the abolition of the Dies committee, and another by Richard Morford, Presbyterian minister and ex-secretary of the United Christian Council for Democracy with which the federation cooperated. Reverend Morford also signed the Communist petition for the abolition of the Dies committee and a statement in defense of the Communist Party.

Reverend Morford's article, Statement on Dumbarton Oaks, comes out in support of the decision of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference and devotes much space in endorsing the voting procedure for the United Nations Security Council proposed by the Russians and adopted by the conference. His article ends with an appeal urging support for the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and urges that such support should be registered immediately with the Secretary of State.

The proposals adopted by the Dumbarton Oaks Conference had the full support of the Communist Party. The Communist Party conducted an intensive campaign to induce the American people to pressure Congress to adopt the Dumbarton Oaks proposals without revisions. The spokesmen of the Communist Party on foreign affairs wrote articles, made speeches, and issued statements in favor of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. The Communists tied in the proposals of Dumbarton Oaks with the agreement reached at the Yalta Confer-

ence, Eugene Dennis, in an article, Yalta and America's National Unity, in Political Affairs. In calling for national unity on the basis of Teheran and Yalta, Mr. Dennis wrote:

It is especially essential today for effecting a broader, national bipartisan coalition in the 79th Congress, so as to create a sufficient majority in the Senate to act favorably on the Dumbarton Oaks world security agreement and its indispensable economic corollary, the Bretton Woods [conference] decisions.

Communist Adam Lapin, Daily Worker columnist on foreign affairs, in the February 1945 issue of Political Affairs, writes favorably of President Roosevelt's message to Congress because:

He emphasized the absolute necessity for developing the democratic and fully integrated world security system projected at Dumbarton Oaks.

Communist-front organizations, Communist-controlled farmer and labor unions, all of them passed resolutions in favor of Dumbarton Oaks.

The Daily Worker editorial of October 11, 1944, commented:

The Dumbarton Oaks plan is a tremendous awe-inspiring piece of open diplomacy; the results of the first world security conferences are not only being placed before all the United Nations, but before the people of the world. * * * The Dumbarton Oaks proposals are so promising that it must become clear to all patriots how much the future depends upon the President's reelection.

On the Dumbarton Oaks proposals the Methodist Federation for Social Action followed the line of the Communist Party in every detail.

Social Questions Bulletin, January 1945:

Prof. Samuel L. Hamilton contributed the lead article to this issue of the bulletin under the heading, "The Challenge of 1945 to Christian Education." His article is a composite of Communist and one-worldism generalities and utopianisms mixed with confusion and contradictions on the topics of individualism, Christian social action, and so forth. I wish to call your attention to the fact that practically all the contributors to the bulletin, who are featured in its pages have records of participation in Communist-inspired activities of the Communist Party or Communist-front organizations. Professor Hamilton, who teaches religious education in New York University, signed an open letter sponsored by the pro-Soviet American Council on Soviet Relations. This organization, originally the Friends of Soviet Russia, was organized and controlled by the Communist Party. The funds it collected for relief were turned over either to the Comintern or the Communist Party. It paid the salaries of many organizers working for the Communist Party. The letter of this organization which Professor Hamilton signed urged the President of the United States to call for a declaration of war against Finland in order to enhance American-Soviet relations. He sponsored the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights, an organization interlocked with many avowed and notorious Communist-front organizations. He sponsored the Dinner Forum of the Protestant Forum Associates, publishers of the Protestant, a magazine devoted to the Communist infiltration of the religious field.

On page 8 of the bulletin, Social Issues in Today's World, under the caption, "What Hope for Economic Peace," the following appears:

There has been in recent months no little outcry against political imperialism, particularly on the part of Great Britain. Has it been accompanied by any

evident degree of repentance on the part of the economic imperialists—no less numerous in the United States of America than in Britain? What possible hope, under these conditions, for any real peace in the years ahead?

The bulletin does not tell its readers that political imperialism in our modern times is a most decided Soviet product. Examples of Communist political imperialism are the satellite countries of Europe, Soviet communism's spread in Asia, and Soviet support of fifth-column infiltration and coalitions in other countries all over the globe not yet in the grip of the political imperialism of the Soviet Government.

In spite of these facts, the federation's attack is directed primarily upon the United States and Great Britain. It explains why the above rhetorical questions are not directed against the Soviet Union, for the line of the federation on this question is the line of the Communist Party as expressed in its convention resolution on the present situation and the next tasks, adopted July 28, 1945, which declared:

Powerful reactionary forces in the United States and England, which are centered in the trusts and cartels, are striving to reconstruct liberated Europe on a reactionary basis. Moreover, this is so because the most aggressive circles of American imperialism are endeavoring to secure for themselves political and economic domination of the world.

The United States seeks political and economic domination of the world. That is the gist of the Communist Party resolution. And that is the gist of the statement of the federation already referred to.

Under the caption, "Sever Relations With Franco Spain," the federation takes its stand in favor of the clamor of the Communist Party, demanding that the United States sever diplomatic relations with Spain. This item reports a meeting sponsored by the pro-Soviet, pro-Communist Nation Associates held in Madison Square Garden, on January 2, 1945. Bishop Oxnam, vice president of the federation, was one of the speakers at the meeting whose remarks are quoted in the article.

On the question of the severance of United States diplomatic relations with Spain, the federation and its leaders followed the line of the Communist Party, which in its 1945 resolution demanded that the United States "break diplomatic relations with Fascist Spain."

This issue of the bulletin quotes from an article that appeared in the Communist Party magazine, *Soviet Russia Today*, October 1944. The article on the Soviet constitution is by the pro-Soviet English educator, Sir Charles Trevelyan. The bulletin uses his article to refute the charges that the Soviet Union is a tyranny and Stalin a dictator. The bulletin claims Stalin is a powerful leader, like Churchill and Roosevelt, over a democracy and not a dictatorship, and for proof it quotes Sir Trevelyan, who asserts in the Communist magazine the following:

In the U. S. S. R. everyday affairs are entirely in the hands of the people themselves. There are no superior classes. The only people are the workers and the peasants and they decide everything.

With the following conclusion by Sir Trevelyan, the Methodist Federation for Social Action is in complete agreement. Here is the conclusion:

There are too many persons in our midst ill-disposed to the U. S. S. R. * * * The essential thing is the rising tide of knowledge of the third great democracy that has now joined Britain and America.

The same pro-Soviet propaganda, without a tissue of substance or truth, is contained in the review of the book, *People, Church and State in Modern Russia*, by Paul B. Anderson. The review stresses:

There are some generally accepted principles on which the people of the western democracies and the peoples of Russia are united—the Atlantic Charter and the four freedoms. In fact, the Soviet people might well say that * * * (these) really belonged to them before they were caught up by the west, for they are quite largely covered in the articles in the Soviet constitution. * * * Finally, in answering the question as to the possibility of cooperation, Mr. Anderson says, "In the momentous era before us, there will be great need for kindness, friendliness, and mutual helpfulness, and we may hope that neither the Marxists nor the (Christian) liberals will take intransigent positions, but rather live and let live."

This unvarnished propaganda that the people in the greatest slave state in all history, ruled by a brutal and ruthless dictatorship, bowing to the will of one man, are the actual owners of the four freedoms, given as an argument for the Marxists and the Christian liberals to cooperate and live together is actually an appeal to the Christians to open the doors of their churches and institutions to Communist infiltration and to subject Christians to Communist brainwashing.

Social Questions Bulletin, March 1945:

The leading article in this bulletin is by the Reverend Ernest Free-mont Tittle, of the First Methodist Church of Evanston, Ill. The Reverend Tittle, like most of the contributors to the bulletin, has a record of affiliation with Communist-front organizations. In 1939 he sponsored the National Emergency Conference Call. Among his cosigners were many Communist Party members and well-known fellow-travelers. He was also on the sponsoring committee of the Chicago Conference on Race Relations, held July 22, 1939. This conference was heavily stacked with Communist Party members who participated as delegates from Communist-front organizations and Communist-controlled unions. The Reverend Tittle, treating with the role of the church in the postwar world, gives expression to this amazing statement:

The church, although it is bound to be influenced to some extent by its social environment, must cease to be identical with liberal capitalism, with western culture, with civilization largely based on individual and national self-interest. Protestantism in particular must cease to be identical with "the American way of life" or the British way of life or any other contemporary way of life; it must proclaim and embody God's way of life—the only way that leads to life and not to economic chaos, mass unemployment, mass slaughter, and destruction.

If, as the Reverend Tittle states, undoubtedly with the approval of the Methodist Federal for Social Action, that the church must break with liberal capitalism, with western culture and the American way of life, he necessarily implies that the church must identify itself with an economic system that is different from ours, with a culture that opposes western culture and with a way of life that is different from the American way of life. Since we live in a world of reality, within definitely defined borders and not in the ethereal regions of a befogged ivory tower, we can come to only one conclusion on the Reverend Tittle's statement. It is, that the alternative the Reverend Tittle and the federation offers Protestantism is that it identify itself with the forces operating in the world, whose economic philosophy, cultural standards and way of life are diametrically opposed to our economic system, culture, and way of life. What the Reverend Tittle

and the federation term "God's way of life", is obviously the Marxist, the Communist way of life.

The article in this issue by Ward Crawford Barclay is a reiteration of the Socialist and Communist campaign for the inauguration of socialized medicine in the United States. His article leans heavily on the sources furthering the cause of socialized medicine, organized by Communist physicians and fellow travelers operating through the Physicians Forum. The chairman of the Physicians Forum is Dr. Ernest Boas, who has a long record of Communist-front affiliations. The article comes out in support of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill for socialized medicine. The Methodist Federation for Social Action on the question of socialized medicine, in agreement with the Communist Party resolution of 1945, demands:

Pass the Wagner-Murray-Dingell social-security bill.

The editorial in this issue in support of Wallace is used not only to put the federation behind Wallace, whose position on domestic and international issues was being exploited at the time by the Communist Party, but also for the purpose of winning support for the fundamental philosophic position of the Communists. It is interesting to note that, in this respect, the federation parading as an unofficial church organization, interested in what Professor Ward calls prophetic Christianity, in its support of Wallace, went much further than did the Communist Party.

William Z. Foster, chairman of the Communist Party, writing in *Political Affairs*, September 1946, warned the Communists and the militant followers of the Communists not to be diverted "from co-operating with or seeking out and cultivating, allies and associates from among the followers of Wallace."

Jack Stachel, the shrewdest political tactician among the top leaders of the Communist Party, wrote in *Political Affairs*, September 1947, on the Wallace issue as follows:

The very same reason that led Truman to oust Wallace from the Cabinet also moves labor and the progressive forces to organize themselves as an independent force to support Wallace and his championship of the Roosevelt foreign policy.

The editorial commenting on the opposition to Wallace states:

Involved in it is a struggle between political factors, but underlying the struggle is a contest between conflicting forces deeply rooted in contradictory philosophies of life and government.

The conflicting forces deeply rooted in the philosophy of life and government are none other than the forces that believe in the moral and spiritual force of religion and freedom as a way of life, and representative government responsive to the will of the people, and the forces of materialism and atheism which recognize communism as a way of life, and dictatorship with its negation of individual freedom, as the ideal form of government. The editorial supports the latter, the forces of communism in conflict with freedom.

On page 14 of this issue of the bulletin, seven federation speakers, available for dates, are listed. Out of the 7 listed, 4 have records of affiliation with Communist-front organizations; namely, Prof. Irwin R. Beiler, Rev. Henry H. Crane, Rev. Frederick G. Poole, and Rev. Leonard Tucker.

Social Questions Bulletin, April 1945:

In this issue of the bulletin, an article by Walter G. Muelder, professor of Christian theology and ethics, in the University of Southern California, is important in determining the basic concepts which guide the thinking and action of the leaders of the Methodist Federation for Social Action. Professor Muelder's influence in the federation cannot be underestimated. He was elected vice president of the federation in 1948, and again in 1951.

Writing on the Limitations to Social Effectiveness of the Church, he holds there is taking place an acceleration of social change so rapidly, and on so vast a scale that any institution, the church for example, is hard put to be effectively up with the times. Historically, the vast changes he has in mind can be none other than the changes brought about by the successful spread of communism over vast territories of the globe.

Furthermore, Professor Muelder holds that the church can be in the vanguard of social change only when it is relevant to central social purposes. The only center of social purposes in existence is Moscow, the center of world communism, which insists that the Communists are the vanguard for social change. Does Professor Muelder want the church to be part of the Communist vanguard? An examination of his article undoubtedly will give us an answer to that question.

Since Professor Muelder perceives loyalty to a central purpose for social change on a vast, a global scale, he comes out four-square against national loyalty and sovereignty in favor of a world organization. He puts his position in sharply defined, positive terms, as follows:

To what extent can the church effectively debunk the unethical prestige of sovereignty? To what extent can the church replace it with an effective world loyalty? That (sovereignty of the United States and the loyalty of Americans to it as their Nation, BG) is a problem of overcoming one of the greatest limitations to effective Christian action. It is doubtful that the church can wean the people from loyalty to the Nation until there is brought into existence a world organization worthy of dominant earthly respect.

Why, as Professor Muelder advocates, should the church, a spiritual force, be required to wean the American people away from loyalty to the United States. Without such loyalty, the United States is doomed as a Nation. The forces most active in attempting to break down among the American people their loyalty to the world organization of communism and its central power, the Soviet Union, above all other loyalty. Does Professor Muelder have the Communist type of loyalty in mind when he wants the church to debunk the ethical prestige of sovereignty? There is no other central purpose for social change but the Communist central purpose for social change that demands disloyalty on the part of Americans, and yet Professor Muelder wants the church to be tied to a central purpose for social change and to disloyalty.

The Methodist Federation for Social Action, in its support of the Bretton Woods plan, followed the lead of the Communist Party, which in its 1945 resolution, declared:

Use the Bretton Woods agreement in the interests of the United Nations to promote international economic cooperation and expanding world trade. Grant extensive long-term credits, at low-interest rates, for purposes of reconstruction and industrialization. Expose and combat all efforts of monopoly capital to convert such financial aid into means of extending imperialist control in these countries.

And so the Methodist Federation for Social Action followed the lead of the Communist Party on the Bretton Woods agreement, appealed to its members as follows:

It is time for the people to speak. Members of Congress have not heard enough from home. The close-knit, powerful lobby of high financial interests is busily at work, bringing constant pressure to bear. We urge support of the Bretton Woods agreement in its entirety.

The three articles by Franklin H. Littel:

A Cell in Every Church, Social Questions Bulletin, February 1945.

Protestantism is a "Success," Social Questions Bulletin, March 1945.

Formation of the Group, Social Questions Bulletin, April 1945.

These three articles together form a series. Their author, Franklin H. Littel, is the director of the Student Religious Association, Lane Hall, University of Michigan. Mr. Littel was a member of the executive committee of the Methodist Federation for Social Action, in 1944 and 1945.

Mr. Littel's organizational proposals on the infiltration of religion follow closely the cell techniques on infiltration described in the thesis on organization of both the Communist Party and the Communist International. In his second article, Protestantism is a "Success"—note, success in quotation marks, his views put him in favor of planned economy and in the camp of the Communists who like to call themselves liberals. He writes:

When the Christian Mobilizers and the Christian American Association launch well-financed campaigns to defend monopoly capitalism in the name of "free enterprise," the lip service of Protestant liberals to "planned economy" does not hide the fact that we are doing little indeed to equip centers of disciplined action to effect our well-stated purposes. And labor is wise enough to know that in a showdown between class interest and poorly disciplined good intentions, our middle-class congregations will follow pocketbook rather than liberal program.

To carry out aggressively and boldly a program to win support among church people for a system of planned economy and to build up opposition to the American economic system, Littel strongly advocates the cell concept of organization, developed by the Communists, as the most important element in the formation of the group. Here are some of the salient points of his thesis.

The ethical concern grows out of the group; it is not the center which has brought the group together in the first place.

The center which brought the group together in the first place is the cell. The driving force in the Methodist Federation for Social Action, is the small cell that knows where it is going, that is disciplined and the driving force in the organization. The record will show that the cell in the federation consistently follows the Communist Party line.

Mr. Littel describes the cell as follows:

The cell is a face-to-face group without turnover in membership.

He elaborates:

This working unit in our time is usually called "the cell," a term describing a living thing which subdivides and becomes a whole body.

That is precisely the theory behind the Communist strategy of infiltration, the Communist cell to eventually become the whole body, the dominant force in the organizations, institutions infiltrated. That Mr. Littel knows he is writing about the Communist concept of organi-

zation is clear from the following words of his article, *A Cell in Every Church*:

There are some progressive movements today which have rediscovered the importance of keeping the basic unit small if much is to happen.

The only so-called progressive movements that are consciously built on the cell concept of organization is the Communist Party, the Communist-front organizations and the trade unions and other organizations in which the Communist cells have gained control.

Mr. Littel expands his cell thesis of organization by stating:

Action is undertaken with a sense of discipline which can never be attained by an open meeting called in enthusiasm for the carrying out of some program. For social action, like the missionary outstretch of the group, is conceived as the carefully worked out plan of community purpose—a plan whose carrying power rests in the life of cell, rather than the scattered individual efforts of many well-meaning people.

Mr. Littel, it is plain to see, is a strong advocate of secrecy, on the part of the cell, in the adoption of program leading to action. Why? Because the real motives behind the program can be hidden. The tactic of secrecy is followed by Communist cells in all movements infiltrated and in all front organizations. The Communists not only hide their identity but they never disclose the real reasons and objectives behind the movements they initiate on specific issues and the measures they support and the action they advocate.

The cell form of organization, made up of small disciplined group, bound by a common ideology, meeting in secret behind closed doors, is what Mr. Littel favors and which the leadership of the Methodist Federation for Social Action endorses. What is their purpose? Their purpose is to seize control of the church. Mr. Littel describes the process as follows:

As the cells grow, divide, and separate, they will be white corpuscles of health within the larger Christian community.

In February 1945 a conference of labor leaders took place in London. The American Federation of Labor refused to have anything to do with the conference, known as the World Trade-Union Conference, because it was initiated and inspired by the Communists. The Communist-dominated government unions of the Soviet Union dominated and directed the conference. The conference decided to organize a world federation of unions which was to include the Communist unions of Russia and the satellite countries and the Communist-controlled unions of France, Italy, South America, the Near East, Asia, and Africa. This conference, which the Communists hailed as a move toward world trade-union unity and through which they hoped to gain control of the unions in the free world not yet under their control, received the endorsement and support of the Methodist Federation for Social Action. Following this conference the Communists succeeded in launching a powerful world labor federation under the name "World Federation of Trade Unions."

In endorsing Stalin's move to capture the world trade-union movement, the Methodist Federation just followed the Communist Party resolution of 1945, which endorsed the London Conference for World Trade Union Unity in the following words:

Support the World Labor Congress as the backbone of the unity of the people of all free nations.

The agreement between the Methodist Federation for Social Action and the Communist Party on the question of the Communist campaign for world trade-union unity shows to what extent the federation is used to further the interests of the Communists in areas far afield from the church.

Social Questions Bulletin, October 1945:

In this issue of the Bulletin appear the decisions of the executive committee of the Methodist Federation for Social Action, bearing on organization and program, under the title "A Proposed Program for Study and Action."

The proposed program is divided into two parts. One part presents the federation's basic position and ultimate objectives; the other part deals with the immediate issues the organization campaigns for in order to enlist support for its ultimate objectives.

The federation's program outlined by the executive committee in this article starts off by stating categorically that—

The Methodist Federation for Social Service is an organization which rejects the method of struggle for profit as the economic base of society, and which seeks to replace it with social and economic planning in order to develop a society without class distinctions and privileges.

That declaration of basic principle put the federation four-square against the American economic system and in favor of the Communist economic system based upon social and economic planning.

The executive committee of the federation states it is out "to develop a society without class distinctions and privileges." That is exactly what the Communists tell the people they are out to accomplish. The federation therefore stands for class warfare as the Communists do. Should the system of social-economic planning which the executive committee of the federation seeks to develop be inaugurated in the United States, then all classes will be abolished in the same manner that the Communists abolished classes in the Soviet Union. It will mean that labor, the farmers, intellectuals, small and large businessmen, politicians, and professionals will be ruthlessly eliminated who oppose Communist dictatorial control over the economic resources and life of the country. In adopting the class-war position of the Communists, the federation uses an indirect phraseology that does not sound offensive to American ears.

The executive committee elaborates on its program by stating the Methodist Federation for Social Action—

Seeks the establishment of full democracy and unreserved brotherhood in our political and social life.

Nowhere in the entire article is there an acknowledgment or endorsement of American democracy which has given the American people freedom and well-being, the true marks of brotherhood, on a scale unequalled by any other people on the face of the globe.

Instead, the federation is critical of the American economic system, of American democracy, and the American way of life. Why? Because the federation does not believe in the American type of democracy. The democracy the federation is working for must be achieved under a new system of society, the social-economic planned society after the American democracy is overthrown. The federation, therefore, recognizes democracy only within the boundaries of the Communist system of planned economy. Its position is in agreement

with the resolution of the Communist Party of 1945, which described the Soviet Union as—

The staunchest champion of national freedom, democracy, and world peace.

Furthermore, the executive committee of the federation understands full democracy as the Communists formulate it. Here is how the federation formulates its concept on this question in relation to the United States. I quote:

This calls for complete eradication of fascism—its vestiges and threats—throughout the world and in the United States of America, in particular.

The similarity of this declaration with the Communist Party resolution of 1945 is quite apparent. I quote from the Communist resolution dealing with the same question:

If the reactionary policies and forces of monopoly capital are not checked and defeated, America and the world will be confronted with new aggressions and wars and the growth of reaction and fascism in the United States.

Not one word is contained in the decisions of the executive committee of the federation, on program and organization, that is critical of the Soviet Union. Nowhere is to be found one word condemning its totalitarian, reactionary policies. Not one is uttered against its inhuman and un-Christian practices. No alarm is expressed against its imperialist aggressions in Europe and Asia which threaten the outbreak of a global war. The federation remains silent in the suppression of national independence and all freedom in the countries seized by the Soviets. Such sins of omission and silence on the part of the federation which speaks in the name of a superior and more prophetic Christianity exposes the duplicity of the organization and proves that on the question of democracy and freedom it engages on the same doubletalk that Communists do.

Part 2 of the executive committee's decisions goes into much detail and in the main reiterates the federation's support of the immediate issues, first raised by the Communist Party. There is no need cataloging them. An examination of the federation program on this matter with the Communist Party resolution on tasks of the Communist Party, adopted in 1945, together with its election program, will prove conclusively that the contention, just made, is true.

Social Questions Bulletin, November 1945:

The leading article in this issue, "Science Opens the Door of Production," by Prof. Walter Rautenstrauch, calls for the setting up of machinery through which the Government could take control of the countries' economic resources and operate the industries. The adoption of the measures Professor Rautenstrauch advocated would necessarily pave the way for the speedy socialization of the country. Professor Rautenstrauch, a member of the department of industrial engineering of Columbia University, and a consulting engineer to the manufacturing industries, has a long record of participation in Communist-front movements. Few men have a longer record than he. Professor Rautenstrauch has acted as sponsor, member of executive boards, speaker, signer of appeals, issuer of calls to national conferences of numerous Communist-front organizations.

This issue of the *Social Questions Bulletin* deals with atomic-energy control, endorses the Communist campaign for full employment with

an article written by W. C. B., and an editorial by Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, who was at the time the vice president of the federation.

The issue also calls for the support of socialism in Great Britain, endorses the Communist World Federation of Trade Unions, and supports the Social-Work Action Committee, an organization of workers employed in welfare agencies, which was controlled by members of the Communist Party.

The Ball-Burton-Hatch bill before the United States Senate is attacked in an article by John G. Samsay, public-relations man for the United Steelworkers of America, CIO. The union at the time was strongly under the influence of the Communists. The Communist Party also attacked the Ball-Burton-Hatch bill, and its 1945 resolution contained the demand—

Defeat the Hill-Burton-Hatch antilabor bill.

Bishop Oxnam's editorial plea for the passage of the full-employment bill and the statement of W. C. B. on Religion and Full Employment parallels the position taken by the Communist Party, which first issued the slogan for "full employment" and 60 million jobs. The Communist Party resolution made its position on this question quite clear in these words:

Push the fight for 60 million jobs. Meet the human needs of reconversion. Make the right to work and the second Bill of Rights the law of the land. Support the Murray full-employment bill.

Secretary McMichael, in his report, makes certain that the Federation supported the policy by reporting the following:

On the central burning issue, unemployment, the executive committee supported our total full-employment program and the specific current demands for expanded unemployment compensation, increased minimum wages, and speedy passage of the full-employment bill.

On page 7 appears the statement of the federation on atomic power, authorized by its executive committee and signed by Lewis O. Hartman, chairman; Jack R. McMichael, executive secretary; and Thelma Stevens, recording secretary.

The federation statement on atomic power reads:

Temporary American monopoly over this weapon cannot guarantee the security of America or the peace of the world. Peacemakers cannot emphasize too strongly that the atomic bomb is no substitute for international cooperation in general, or friendship with the Soviet Union in particular.

Decrying American monopoly of the know-how on the atomic bomb was also the position of the Communist Party. A review of this statement will indicate how closely the federation followed the Communist Party line on the atomic question.

The concern of the Communist Party with the question of the atomic bomb and atomic power was directed into 2 fields of activity, though the fields were widely separated, Communist activities in the 2 fields were part and parcel of 1 policy, destroying the advantage the United States holds in the atomic-weapons and energy fields and turning that advantage over to the Soviet Union.

One of the two fields—the espionage field—in this sphere the Communists sought to obtain for the Soviet Government the secrets on atomic weapons and power so carefully guarded by the United States. The Communist Parties of the United States and Canada formed an important and effective branch of the espionage network, which

succeeded in stealing important atomic information for the Soviet Government from both the United States and Canada. The disclosures of the Canadian Royal Commission on the operations of the Soviet espionage networks in both the United States and Canada, and the numerous arrests and convictions in our own country of Communist Party members who acted as atomic spies for the Soviets, furnish ample proof of this contention.

The other field dealing with atomic matters in which the activities of the Communist Party were directed on a large scale was the field of public opinion. In this field the Communist Party sought to build up public opinion in the United States and throughout the world against the right of the United States to the exclusive ownership of the scientific knowledge, the technical equipment, and atomic materials stores and reserves, and atomic weapons even though it all represented a tremendous American scientific achievement that cost the American people billions of dollars.

The cry against the so-called American monopoly of atomic weapons and power was raised by the Communists. They persisted in this charge even after the United States submitted a plan for the control of atomic weapons and power that would make use of atomic weapons for war purposes impossible. They persisted in their objections even after the United States offered, under certain conditions, to place the future of atomic power and the production of atomic weapons entirely under the jurisdiction of an international body of control.

The Methodist Federation for Social Action, however, persisted in following the line of the Communist Party and supporting the proposals of the Soviets on this question. In the statement of the federation already quoted, the federation proposed that the United States give up what it has already achieved in the field of atomic energy, and, instead, achieve, in particular, friendship with the Soviet Union, or as the Communist Party put it, "cement American-Soviet friendship and unity to promote an enduring peace."

The statement of the Methodist Federation for Social Action on atomic power continues:

How could the United States possibly gain by clinging to her certainly temporary monopoly?

Eugene Dennis, secretary of the Communist Party, in his report to the national committee of the Communist Party, in July 1946, repeated the same monopoly charge, stating:

In the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, Baruch on behalf of the administration and Wall Street, advances a program for imposing America's will on other states and nations, for maintaining unilateral control and monopoly by the United States of the manufacture and use of atomic bomb and nuclear energy.

To end so-called American monopoly in the atomic field, to put the United States out of the manufacturing of atomic bombs, in a divided crisis-ridden world, threatened by Communist imperialist expansion and military aggression, the Methodist Federation for Social Action proposes the following:

Fortunately there exists an alternative. The alternative is that under proper safeguards, the atomic bomb and its manufacturing processes be transferred to and controlled by the United Nations Organization and its Security Council. The President and the Government of the United States should make known a will to effect such a transfer and to effect it speedily.

In plain language, the federation demands that we turn our atomic know-how and gigantic scientific and production installation on the atomic field, costing the American people billions of dollars, over to the Security Council of the United Nations. The Soviet Union is a member of the Security Council in which she has the right to exercise veto power. Transferring American atomic resources of all kinds over to the Security Council would make the Soviet Union one of its controlling agencies. Such a step, as the federation proposes, would be tantamount to turning over to the Soviet Government, as one of the controlling agencies of the Security Council, everything we know about atomic power, control over our atomic facilities, and the authority to cripple us completely in this field. This advantage the Methodist Federation for Social Service, in the name of religion and progressive Christianity, would give to the Communist government which is plotting our destruction.

The article on page 8 of the bulletin, The unofficial Social Action Fellowship, by Rev. Richard Morford of the Presbyterian Church is of the utmost importance in indicating the wide area of the Protestant churches subjected to Communist infiltration and the influence which the Methodist Federation for Social Action exerts, in the matter of infiltration, upon the other denominations of the Protestant Church.

Richard Morford, a minister of the Protestant Church, is the executive secretary of the United Christian Council for Democracy. His article deals with the United Christian Council for Democracy, which he describes as an unofficial social-action fellowship. What kind of an organization is it? Here is Morford's explanation:

Are you acquainted with some of the other unofficial groups corresponding with the Methodist Federation for Social Service; Church League for Industrial Democracy (Episcopal); Evangelical and Reformed Council for Social Reconstruction; Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice; Rauschenbush Fellowship of Baptists; Presbyterian Fellowship for Social Action? These five plus the MFSS, cooperate through a federation known as the United Christian Council for Democracy.

These 6 unofficial church organizations, patterned after 1 of its cooperating organizations, the Methodist Federation for Social Action, operate in churches of the Protestant denominations with a membership of 32,260,610 among the following: Baptists, 15,464,718; Episcopalians, 2,160,207; Evangelical and Reformed, 714,583; Unitarians, 75,000; Presbyterians, 3,492,029; Methodists, 10,492,029.

Besides, Reverend Morford's organization has maintained contacts with official and unofficial church organizations of other denominations concerned primarily with social education and action.

The position of the United Christian Council for Democracy, which operates in churches with a combined membership of over 32 million members is expounded by Reverend Morford in the following words:

Two challenges facing the church have been accepted by the six unofficial groups of the UCCD (United Christian Council for Democracy) to a degree which cannot be expected of the majority of the church: (1) To be a prophetic voice for a *new social order* in harmony with Christian principles; (2) to implement the Christian imperatives for a new order with the social, economic, political, or legislative action required for its achievement.

But the United Christian Council for Democracy goes much further than declaring itself in favor of a new social order. It adopts the basic Communist position adopted by the Methodist Federation for

Social Action in its Crisis leaflets and various programmatic declarations. Morford, in his article, goes on to elaborate as follows:

It may be said that the stand taken by the Methodist Federation and kindred groups can be called advanced only in quite relative terms. * * * This advanced stand becomes more specific in the statement of principles adopted by the UCCD when this federation of unofficial church social-action groups was created. Were we to revise the statement today we should probably not speak so exclusively in economic terms. Nevertheless, we would continue to recognize the hard economic core of the worldwide human problem and our convictions in this area would be no less radical. For this is what the statement said in part:

We reject the profit-seeking economy and the capitalistic way of life with its private ownership of the things upon which the lives of all depend. * * * We seek to establish a social economy which, under social ownership and democratic control of the common means of life, will make possible the highest potential development of persons and society. * * * We propose to support the necessary political and economic action to implement these aims.

It is clear from what the Reverend Morford writes that the United Christian Council for Democracy followed closely the Communist Party line, not only on basic fundamental principles but also on immediate issues. In this respect it did precisely what the Methodist Federation for Social Action did. It duplicated the federation's policies because the federation was the driving spirit, the inspirational heart of the United Christian Council for Democracy.

Can the effectiveness of the infiltration activities of the UCCD on behalf of basic Communist principles and the immediate issues of the Communist Party be measured? We will let the Reverend Morford answer this question in his own words for he wrote:

You ask about the outstretch and effectiveness of these unofficial social action groups and of their federation. The constituency of the six organizations plus the selected liberal churchmen in other denominations with whom the UCCD keeps in regular contact numbers roughly 10,000. A rather small minority as numbers go! Yet, we have ample evidence to show that many of these churchmen pick up our challenge time after time and go to work. First they act themselves, then move to their own congregations, next among other church people, and finally to the civic organizations of their communities. Often these men and women are at the very center of the local efforts on behalf of democracy working in harness with community leaders from all walks of life.

Ten thousand preachers, backing up Communist principles or Communist demands, represent when organized for infiltration purposes by organizations like the Methodist Federation and other similar unofficial church social action organizations, can do a tremendous amount of harm in poisoning the minds of the American people, because the American people trust their religious leaders.

Social Questions Bulletin, February 1946:

The Methodist Federation for Social Action is an unofficial organization operating in the Methodist Church, in particular, and in the churches of the Protestant denominations, generally. An organization, that has succeeded in spite of its definite Communist proclivities, in gaining the support and affiliation of outstanding ministers, bishops, and theologians of the Methodist Church, which has greatly impressed its views on the church in both religious and secular matters, should make its position clear on what it seeks of the church and what it considers its basic religious concepts.

This is precisely what is done in the February 1946 Bulletin in an official statement of the federation, under the title, "A Bold Church Is Required," and in an article by Joseph T. Fletcher on "Religion

and War," a digest of a statement made before a meeting of the United Christian Council for Democracy.

In the statement, "A Bold Church Is Required," the federation takes the following position:

Socialist society is the next higher form of organization * * * The form the transition from capitalist to Socialist society will take in America is being determined by the comparative strength of the two conflicting elements in capitalist society. Ever since our economy became monopolist and imperialist, its ruling principle has been the concentration of power in the hands of the strong. * * * Our monopolist imperialist economy pushes toward a final Fascist period for capitalist society.

That official stand of the Federation, maintaining that the Socialist form of society is a higher form than the one under which we live, and accepting the Communist position on class warfare, including the idea that the United States is entering the final period of the breakdown of its economic system—fascism; hews close to the Communist Party line. Eugene Dennis, the General Secretary of the Communist Party in his report to the Communist Party, expressed himself in language similar to that of the official statement of the Methodist Federation for Social Action. He said:

It is clear, therefore, that imperialist reaction is growing at a rapid pace in this country. Obviously, if the current offensive of American reaction succeeds, the road will have been readied for fascism's rise to power. (Report to National Committee of the Communist Party, July 1946.)

W. Z. Foster, the chairman of the Communist Party, in an article in Political Affairs of August 1946, on "American Imperialism Leader of World Reaction," expressed himself similarly, in these words:

In the current offensive of reactionary capitalism, spearheaded by American imperialism, strong tendencies for a renaissance of fascism are in evidence.

The people are finding out by experience what Marx told them, what our statisticians are confirming every year and many capitalists are now admitting, that the capitalist principle is technically incapable of meeting their economic needs and cultural aspirations. * * * The clear duty of religious leaders is to declare judgment concerning the basic principles of Socialist society.

The church, therefore, in the opinion of the federation, must accept the Marxist point of view; must proclaim, as the Communists do, that the American economic and social system is technically incapable of meeting the economic and cultural aspirations of the American people. Through this concept the Methodist Federation for Social Action seeks to transform the church from a spiritual organization into a dynamic Marxist revolutionary organization for the attainment of a Socialist form of society. The "Bold Church" the federation favors, is a church that strikes out boldly for socialism, one that is an effective instrument for Communist political warfare against the accepted form of American society.

The official statement of the federation adds:

The clear duty of religious leaders is to declare judgment concerning the basic principles of Socialist society.

The federation, therefore, wants the religious leaders to preach a religious creed, not based upon the Bible and in defense of the American way of life, but one that is based upon the atheistic foundations of the philosophy of Marx. The federation wants the ministers to declare their judgment against the social economic system under which Americans live and prosper today in favor of the Socialist system, which in Russia and the satellite countries has brought the peoples

brutal tyranny, conditions of wretchedness, unparalleled in our own and other capitalist countries, and actual starvation.

In the article, *Religion and War*, Dr. Fletcher writes:

For a while we suffered from a most untheological and unscientific confidence in gradual progress. It is based on a very flimsy assumption that man is an essentially rational animal who can be depended upon to act individually and collectively, with cool judgment and common sense. In the face of recent, rough, rude, and bloody events that whole theory of progress came tumbling down upon our heads.

Here progress and gradual progress, through constructive peaceful measures, the concept of change and betterment through reform, is discarded as untheological. Dr. Fletcher, evidently accepts Stalin's position on reform and the Federation evidently agrees with both Stalin and Dr. Fletcher. Stalin on *Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, published by the Foreign Language Publishing House, Moscow, in 1951, wrote:

Hence the transition from capitalism to socialism and the liberation of the working class from the yoke of capitalism cannot be effected by slow changes, by reforms, but only by a qualitative change of the capitalist system by revolution. Hence, in order not to err in policy, one must be a revolutionist, not a reformist (p. 1-6).

Dr. Fletcher's statement, like Stalin's, is the gospel against gradual progress and constructive reform. It advocates revolution, quick and violent. Dr. Fletcher does not trust in man, God's creature, as a rational human being. He trusts those who oppose peaceful methods, who reject gradualism. To him gradual progress is untheological, hence un-Christian. Dr. Fletcher's concept is outrageous to the concept of Christianity.

What does Dr. Fletcher actually propose in place of the accepted theology of Christian ethics? He proposes the acceptance by the church of the Communist position on class war. The federation bulletin did not object to his astounding words, neither did its officers, including Bishop Lewis O. Hartman, president; Bishop James C. Baker, vice president; and Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, vice president. I quote from Dr. Fletcher's statement:

The problem of international war, on any scientific view of cause and effect, is part of the problem of class war.

Class war was described by Lenin in his pamphlet, *Left Communism*, as "a war a hundred times more difficult, prolonged, and complicated than the most stubborn of ordinary wars between countries." Dr. Fletcher, as does Lenin, visualizes class warfare as a war on a vast scale, a war to establish a new world order based on socialism. He develops his point of view as follows:

Even if the world powers socialized their economies, the anarchy of national sovereignty would still produce its evil effects.

Dr. Fletcher here repeats the internationalism of the Communists who have for their final objective—world revolution. National sovereignty, writes Dr. Fletcher, is anarchy. It produces evil effects. It is not enough to establish socialism in one country. Socialism must be established throughout the world. Hence, if we follow Dr. Fletcher's logic, national sovereignty, including the sovereignty of the United States, must be destroyed in order to pave the way for the victory of internationalism based upon the class war concepts of the Communists.

These two statements, that of the Methodist Federation and Dr. Fletcher, contain proposals of the most far-reaching consequences to the church for they advocate changing the most basic religious concepts of the Christian Church and theology to conform with the fundamental philosophy of communism and its revolutionary program. The two statements would have the church follow its lead and abandon altogether the traditional religious principles which Marxism cannot tolerate.

Social Questions Bulletin, July 1946:

The close ties between the Methodist Federation for Social Action and the Communist movement is established by the article, The Moral Issue in Germany, by Martin Hall.

In the article are expressed the views of the Communist Party on the situation in Germany. The article also reiterates the hackneyed Communist position on fascism, stating:

This war was fought to destroy fascism as the worst threat to civilization in our times, a threat that exists in every country, the United States not excluded.

In the footnote to the article, the editor of the bulletin points out that,

For 12 years Hall was a German journalist connected from 1933-36 with the German anti-Nazi underground movement. He was expatriated by Hitler and is now an American citizen. From 1943-45 he has taught as a visiting lecturer at the Pacific School of Religion in Berkeley, Calif.

Mr. KUNZIG. What are the facts about the life of the amazing Martin Hall?

Mr. GITLOW. Martin Hall is also known by the name of Herman Jacobs. He is a Communist of long standing, a well-known figure in the Communist Party of Germany. He has sponsored Communist-front movements in the country which gave him asylum and citizenship. He was vice president of the German-American League for Culture, a Communist organization. He was also editor of the German Communist newspaper printed in the United States, Volksecho. He was a contributor to the monthly magazine of the Communist Party, the New Masses. He contributed numerous articles to the official publication of the Communist International, International Press Correspondence, in 1935, 1936, and 1937. None but accredited Communist Party leaders wrote for International Press Correspondence. In order to get his United States citizenship he had to swear falsely and deny that he was a Communist, that he entertained Communist beliefs, and was affiliated with Communist organizations.

Social Questions Bulletin, April 1946:

On March 5, 1946, Winston Churchill delivered his famous Fulton, Mo., speech in which he called attention to the threat of Soviet communism to the free world, and in which speech he coined the famous phrase, "behind the Iron Curtain." He called for close collaboration between the United States and Great Britain in combatting the threat of communism.

The day after, on March 6, the Daily Worker came out in screaming headlines, which read as follows:

Anti-Soviet Threats Fan World War III.

Churchill Asks Anglo-United States Imperialist Rule of the World.

Halt the Anglo-United States War Move.

On March 5, on the same day that Winston Churchill delivered his speech, the National Secretariat of the Communist Party, the most powerful committee of the Communist Party, considered the general staff of the revolution, issued a statement signed by its members, William Z. Foster, Eugene Dennis, Robert Thompson, and John Williamson. All four were indicted by a Federal grand jury for violation of the Smith Act. Foster because of illness was not brought to trial. The other three were convicted. Williamson and Dennis are now in a Federal penitentiary. Thompson skipped bail and is a fugitive from justice.

The secretariat of the Communist Party declared:

The scheme for world domination comes right out of the circle of the big trusts, the huge monopolies in the United States who see a chance to use their enormous power * * *. It is above all a scheme to save the capitalist system as it heads into deeper crisis, contradictions and antagonisms. The trusts are ready to spill mankind's blood to save their rotten system * * *. The du Pont-Hearst expansionist schemes of world domination voiced by Byrnes and Vandenburg do not represent the will of the American people who desire unity and peace. Byrnes must go.

The Secretariat of the Communist Party initiated an extensive campaign on Churchill's Fulton, Mo., speech, directed against Great Britain and the United States. It called for support of the Soviet Union. It also called for the following action to counteract Churchill's speech:

To preserve peace let the American people speak, act, unite.

Organize mass meetings and demonstrations.

Send telegrams and resolutions to President Truman, to your Congressmen, to the press.

The Methodist Federation for Social Action answered the Communist Party's Secretariat's call for action immediately. Jack McMichael, the federation's executive secretary, acted at once. It was impossible to respond much sooner. The declaration of the Secretariat of the Communist Party was published in the Daily Worker on March 6, 1946. On March 6, 1946, Jack McMichael sent a telegram in the name of the federation to President Truman, which among other things declared:

His (Churchill's program, bg) would split and destroy UNO in its infancy, begin an atomic armament race and lead all mankind to unprecedented disaster. Your presence in Fulton added weight to this dangerous speech. We urge you to disassociate yourself with Churchill's Tory speech and outlook.

The telegram's criticism of Churchill's speech followed the line and instructions of the Secretariat of the Communist Party.

In this issue of the bulletin, Jack McMichael's report indicates that the federation in its activities was busily engaged following the Communist Party line in the fight for FEPC, price control extension, minimum wage increases, social security extension, opposition to the Case and other bills branded as antilabor by the Communist Party, in the Communist projected struggle for civilian control of the atomic bomb and against peacetime conscription. He concluded his report in these words:

As indicated in this issue's editorial, we responded quickly to Churchill's speech.

Not only did the Methodist Federation for Social Action respond to the call for action issued by the Secretariat of the Communist

Party, with lightning speed, it also made counteraction to Churchill's Fulton, Mo., speech a major campaign of the federation. The following call for action on the part of all branches and members of the federation is prominently boxed. It reads:

Methodist Federation for Social Action—Write or wire President Truman and the Secretary of State expressing your opposition to a holy war against the Soviet Union. Do this as individuals and as conference or local chapters of the Methodist Federation for Social Action. Preach about it from your pulpits. Discuss it in your youth fellowship groups. Write letters to your local newspapers. Join with other groups and individuals in organizing local action in opposition to war.

This action of the federation, in response to directives of the Secretariat of the Communist Party, was undoubtedly taken with the full knowledge and agreement of the officers of the federation. Neither Bishop Lewis O. Hartman, the federation's president, and Bishops G. Bromley Oxnam and James C. Baker, the federation's vice presidents, objected. No statement ever appeared, in the bulletin or any other publication, from any one of them, that they objected to a campaign initiated by the general staff of the Communist Party or to its political line. Nor is there evidence in the bulletins or in the affairs of the federation, at meetings, conferences and in official reports on the federation's activities that the bishops questioned the Communist affinity and line of the federation and the overwhelming preponderance of fellow travelers who constituted the bulk of contributors to the Social Questions Bulletin, the official publication of the federation. Neither did they complain of the open Communist activities of prominent federation members and leaders.

The April 1946 issue of the bulletin is also revealing in other respects. The lead article, *The Utopia of Jesus*, was written by Alva W. Taylor, who has a long Communist-front record. He signed the letter of the American Council on Soviet Relations, a Communist-front, calling upon the President to declare war on Finland, as demanded by the Soviet Union and the Communist Party. He signed a Communist appeal in 1943 calling for the dissolution of the Dies committee. He was an editorial adviser of the *Protestant*, a notorious Communist magazine serving as an instrument for the Communist infiltration of religion. He was a sponsor of the Communist People's Institute of Applied Religion, together with many well-known Communist leaders and with such Methodist Federation stalwarts as Charles C. Webber, Jack McMichael, and Dr. Harry F. Ward. This Communist organization on the religious field received financial support from a Communist foundation—the Sound View Foundation. All the officials of the Sound View Foundation were Communist Party members; namely, Alfred Hirsch, Joseph Brodsky, and Robert W. Dunn. Prof. Alva W. Taylor also signed an appeal to Governor Dewey, calling upon him to grant a pardon to a Communist professor, who was convicted of perjury and sent to prison. In addition, Taylor, a professor of Christian social ethics at Vanderbilt University, served as the secretary treasurer of the Communist dominated Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

In his article in the bulletin, Professor Taylor advocates changing the church into an instrument primarily "organized to promote social reform." He insists that the church be more than a school for Christian living by converting it into "the advance guard of new and un-

tried ideas." The Communists, too, consider themselves the advance guard of revolution of new and untried ideas. Professor Taylor advocates turning the church into a political organization, which "would make politics a means of ministry."

The article by Archey D. Ball attacking Churchill's Fulton, Mo., speech takes the Communist position that peace within the framework of the capitalist system is impossible. He writes:

Winston Churchill's speech in Missouri reveals why he was not returned to office * * * It is ridiculous to talk peace, unless we cease the unthinking acceptance of the economic system into which we happen to be born.

And since Americans happen to be born under the capitalist system of society it is ridiculous for them to talk of peace. The alternative, logically, is to first overthrow the system and the government under which they live, just as the Communists suggest.

The Reverend Ball in his article also writes:

To seek change, to the Un-American Committee of Congress is to be a Communist. Of course this is nonsense.

Mr. KUNZIG. But why did the Reverend Ball use the term phrased by the Communist Party and used by the Daily Worker against the House Committee on Un-American Activities by calling that committee the un-American committee of Congress?

Mr. GITLOW. His Communist-front record may explain that. The Reverend Ball sponsored the American Rescue Ship Mission created by the Communists through a Communist-dominated organization known as the United American Spanish Aid Committee, the chairman of which, Dr. Edward K. Barsky, was a member of the Communist Party. Reverend Ball also sponsored the Conference on Constitutional Liberties and signed an appeal to the Governor of California urging him to dismiss the charges against Sam Darcy, Communist Party leader on the west coast.

The two other contributors to this issue worth mentioning are Dr. Willard Uphaus, who has a long and notorious record of affiliations and sponsorships of Communist-front organizations, and Clark Forman, president of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, who is well known as the spearhead of the Communist drive in the South.

The article, What Is Free Enterprise, attacking the economic system under which we live from the Communist standpoint, was written by Oliver Blakestone, a British Communist, and originally appeared in the Communist magazine Peace News, published in London.

The evidence, with every issue of the Social Questions Bulletin, piles up overwhelming proof that the Methodist Federation for Social Action conforms to a definite pattern which can be defined as follows:

It is a Marxist organization committed to the overthrow of the social-economic system and the political government which sustains it—the United States Government. It favors the revolutionary and not the democratic process. It, therefore, supports the Communist program and the Communist Party of the United States. The federation is pro-Soviet and not pro-American. Every issue of the bulletin of the federation supports Communist position on social-economic matters and the Soviet Union on the international issues before the world. Its ideological leader, inspirational head, political beacon, and founder, Dr. Harry F. Ward, is a member of the Communist Party. So is the federation's executive secretary, Rev. Jack R. McMichael,

the dynamic organizer of the organization and the Communist Party's political commissar within the organization.

The Methodist Federation for Social Action has collaborated and affiliated with organizations on the religious field definitely known to be under the control of the Communist Party, and with similar Communist-dominated organizations in other fields as well. The federation has persistently followed the Communist Party line and has engaged in campaigns initiated and led by the Communist Party.

The Methodist Federation for Social Action is an instrument that is used by the Communist Party for the infiltration of Protestant churches, youth organizations, women's organizations, and educational institutions. The federation serves both as a front organization on the religious field and an auxiliary of the Communist Party.

Social Questions Bulletin, November 1946:

The leading article in this issue of the bulletin is a reprint of a section of Wallace's letter to President Truman, mailed in the summer of 1946, in which the former Vice President of the United States opposes American policy toward the Soviet Union. The letter strongly urged a policy of appeasement in our relations to Communist Russia. Wallace wrote:

We should be prepared, even at the expense of risking epithets of appeasement, to agree to reasonable Russian guaranties of security.

In addition, the letter approved the Communist seizure of the Baltic and Balkan countries and their inclusion in the expanding Communist empire. In approving the enslavement of the people of these countries to communism, Wallace wrote:

Our interest in establishing democracy in Eastern Europe, where democracy by and large has never existed, seems to her an attempt to reestablish the encirclement of unfriendly neighbors which was created after the last war and which might serve as a springboard of still another effort to destroy her.

The publication of the Wallace letter to President Truman was hailed by the Communist Party and used to spearhead a campaign in favor of the Soviet Union. It was used to support the position of the Soviet Union in its relations to the United States and the Western Powers.

More of the pro-Soviet Communist line appears in the article of Floyd Mulkey, a member of the Methodist Federation for Social Action in Chicago. His article, *Where Disarmament Must Begin*, denies the existence of Soviet imperialism in the following terse sentence:

Moreover, Great Britain has a world empire extended out of all proportion to her present power potential, while the opposite is true of the U. S. S. R.

Floyd Mulkey just ignores the fact that Communist imperialism has engulfed almost all of Eastern Europe, and at the time the article was written was planning to take over China's vast territory with its 450 million people. Mulkey's statement is either based upon profound ignorance of the facts about Communist imperialism or else is deliberately written to misinform the American people about Communist imperialist expansion.

The small item by Fran Allen, on page 115, is by the publicity director of the Department Store Employees' Union, of New York City, at the time a Communist-dominated union. Another small item

on page 115 is taken from a newsletter published by the Communist Party under the name of In Fact.

On page 117, under the caption, "Ratliff Memorial Library Books Ready," 29 books are listed as available to federation members for a 3-week period, free of charge, postage to be paid by the federation. Out of the 29 books available, 17 are by authors who are either members of the Communist Party or connected with Communist-front organizations. Out of these 17, 10 were public or secret members of the Communist Party, 1 of them a paid agent of the Soviet Government, and 1 a Soviet espionage agent.

Jack R. McMichael, in his report as executive secretary of the federation, published in the bulletin on page 116, devotes a large section of the report to statistics on prices and wages based almost entirely on the findings of the Labor Research Association, which is the research department of the Communist Party.

In this issue of the bulletin, the article, Religion and Labor, by Rev. Charles C. Webber, outlines a program based upon the class struggle. Reverend Webber contends that big business is struggling for profits and power, causing poverty midst potential plenty, while labor is struggling for security, peace, and freedom. That, of course, is the Marxist, the Communist, contention. He calls upon the religious groups to unite on a program for action.

In this article Reverend Webber presents his concept of God. The god he writes about is a god cloaked in the red flag of communism. He calls his god "a living god." He describes his god as:

One who is working for the establishment of his commonwealth and that of man upon the earth, for the establishment of a planned society with economic abundance: a god not of the "status quo," but a revolutionary god who is seeking to change us as individuals and to change our economic institutions.

Planned society is the Communist society typified by the Soviet Union. Reverend Webber wants a revolutionary god to change our society into a planned society, into communism.

Reverend Webber proceeds to outline a plan of action to achieve his program for religion and labor which calls for the infiltration and exploitation of the religious organizations of all denominations.

Reverend Webber's orientation toward the eastern horizon of the hammer and sickle needs no further amplification. However, it is necessary to indicate that Reverend Webber, in his article, urges American organized labor, without exceptions or reservations, to join the World Federation of Trade Unions set up and dominated by the state unions of the Soviet Union and the Communist satellite countries.

Reverend Webber's Marxist, pro-Communist orientation was not a secret which he kept to himself. He played too prominent a role in Communist-front organizations. Because of his various activities, Reverend Webber became one of the most controversial figures in the Methodist Church. He left his position as executive secretary of the Methodist Federation for Social Action to become an organizer for the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, at a time when the union cooperated closely with the Communist Party, and when its president, the late Sidney Hillman, collaborated with the Russian unions in perfecting an international labor federation into which to enroll the world's trade unions, thereby putting them under the hegemony of the Communists. Reverend Webber became director of the Virginia CIO-PAC, when its parent organization, the National CIO

Political Action Committee, was honeycombed from top to bottom with Communists, Soviet spies, and fellow travelers.

Reverend Webber's activities aroused the indignation of many members of the Methodist Church. Their protests were responsible for Reverend Webber's case being considered by the New York East Conference of the church. Reverend Webber, dealing with these protests and the hearing given him, wrote, as follows, in the Social Questions Bulletin of December 1946:

After I presented my reasons for being kept in the active relationship, the committee unanimously adopted a motion that they approve Bishop Oxnam's continuance of me in active ministerial relationship. Whereupon Bishop Oxnam appointed me as chaplain to organized labor.

Bishop Oxnam was vice president of the Methodist Federation for Social Action when he appointed Reverend Webber, in spite of the many protests against him, an official chaplain of the Methodist Church to organized labor.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Kornfeder and Mr. Gitlow, both of your subpoenas will be continued. Thank you very much for your comprehensive testimony.

Mr. Counsel, have you another witness?

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Leonard Patterson.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give at this hearing shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. PATTERSON. I do.

Mr. SCHERER. Have a seat. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you give your full name for the record, sir?

TESTIMONY OF LEONARD PATTERSON

Mr. PATTERSON. Leonard Patterson.

Mr. KUNZIG. I note that you are not accompanied by counsel, and therefore I want to inform you for the record that it is your privilege to have a lawyer present and advise you, if you so desire. I take it you prefer to testify without one; is that right?

Mr. PATTERSON. That is right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Patterson, would you give us your present address, please?

Mr. PATTERSON. 110-39 156th Street, Jamaica, Long Island.

Mr. KUNZIG. Where were you born, sir, and when?

Mr. PATTERSON. I was born in Wayne County, N. C., in the year 1906, the month of February 2.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is your present occupation, Mr. Patterson?

Mr. PATTERSON. I am shipyard employee. I am a rigger by trade.

Mr. KUNZIG. Where are you employed?

Mr. PATTERSON. Bethlehem shipyards.

Mr. KUNZIG. Where is that?

Mr. PATTERSON. 27th Street, Brooklyn, and Hoboken, N. J.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Patterson, were you ever a member of the Young Communist League?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. When did you go into the Young Communist League?

Mr. PATTERSON. In the fall of 1928.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you ever become a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. When?

Mr. PATTERSON. 1930.

Mr. KUNZIG. You were a regular, card-carrying, dues-paying member of the Communist Party?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. When did you leave the party, if you left it?

Mr. PATTERSON. In the year of 1937.

Mr. KUNZIG. What positions did you hold in the Young Communist League first?

Mr. PATTERSON. I was a member of the national committee of the Young Communist League from 1929 until the time I went out in 1935. I also was a member of the national bureau, that was an executive body of the national committee.

Mr. KUNZIG. Of the Young Communist League?

Mr. PATTERSON. Of the Young Communist League. I was district organizer of the Young Communist League in the Philadelphia district in 1931, was—

Mr. KUNZIG. Where were your headquarters in Philadelphia?

Mr. PATTERSON. I think it was 8 North 19th Street.

Mr. KUNZIG. In Philadelphia?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes. I was district organizer of Maryland district and Columbia district in 1934 and 1935; I held many positions in the Young Communist League. It would take me half an hour to tell you all of them.

Mr. KUNZIG. Those are the main ones?

Mr. PATTERSON. Those are the most important ones.

Mr. KUNZIG. When you were in the Young Communist League did you ever know one Jack McMichael?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. What position did he hold in the Young Communist League?

Mr. PATTERSON. He was a member of the New York district of the Young Communist League and was a member of the top fraction of the Young Communist League and the Communist Party in the American League Against War and Fascism. Also he was a member of the top fraction of the American Youth Congress that was organized around 1934.

Mr. KUNZIG. You knew him then as one of the leading members of the Young Communist League?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. I hand you a document marked "Patterson Exhibit 1" for identification. I am very carefully holding my hand over any names mentioned and in passing you this document marked "Exhibit 1" for identification I show you a picture and ask you if you recognize that person.

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Who is that?

Mr. PATTERSON. That is the McMichael I recognize who was in the Young Communist League together with me from 1934 until I went out in 1935.

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. KUNZIG. Let the record show, Mr. Chairman, that the witness has identified a document which is a photostatic copy of an article from the New York World Telegram, September 15, 1951, headlined, "Controversial Federation Retains Methodist Name."

"Body Reelects Reverend McMichael," and then there is a picture under which appears the name of Reverend McMichael.

Mr. SCHERER. The record may so indicate.

Mr. KUNZIG. I also at this time, Mr. Chairman, would like to offer this document marked "Patterson Exhibit 1" for identification, into evidence as Patterson Exhibit No. 1.

Mr. SCHERER. It will be so received.

(The photostatic copy of the article from the New York World Telegram, dated September 15, 1951, was received in evidence as Patterson Exhibit No. 1.)¹

Mr. KUNZIG. What positions did you hold in the Communist Party, itself, Mr. Patterson?

Mr. PATTERSON. I was a member of the district committee and district bureau of the Communist Party of the Philadelphia district in the year of 1931. At the same time I was district organizer of the Young Communist League. I was a member of the section committee of the Communist Party at Baltimore in 1934 and 1935, and in the latter part of 1935 to 1937, the time I went out of the Communist Party, I was a member of the district committee of the Philadelphia district of the Communist Party.

I also held a position as a member of the central committee of the Negro Commission of the Communist Party in 1933 and part of 1934 and other positions I held in the party.

Mr. SCHERER. Let me ask, did you ever know in your work in the Communist Party a Rev. Harry F. Ward?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you know him well?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes; I worked with him.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you explain to the committee just how you worked with him and where?

Mr. PATTERSON. In New York City, I believe in 1933 or early 1934—I believe it was 1933—Dr. Ward, Earl Browder, myself, Victor Jerome, Manning Johnson, and other top leading members of the Communist Party were assigned to a top fraction. In other words, a top policymaking body of the Communist Party—by the central committee of the Communist Party to prepare—

Mr. SCHERER. You say Dr. Ward was a member of that fraction?

Mr. PATTERSON. I said that—to prepare for a conference to sponsor a broader conference against war and fascism to be held later on in the year of 1933—I believe the year is 1933, either 1933 or 1934. This top policy body met at 799 Broadway, where many of the party front organizations met at that time, and again there was a conference held in Chicago. I believe that was the second congress against war and fascism.

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder returned to the hearing room at this point.)

¹ See page 2139.

PATTERSON EXHIBIT No 1

New York World Telegram 9/15/51
 What the Reds Are Up To

Controversial Federation Retains Methodist Name

Body Re-elects Rev. McMichael

By FREDERICK WOLTMAN,
 Staff Writer.

The Rev. Jack R. McMichael, who over the years has shown a marked partiality for Communist front causes still occupies the saddle in the Methodist Federation for Social Action.

He was overwhelmingly re-elected executive secretary at its annual conference in Evanston, Ill. The opposition largely stayed away so resolutions demanding his resignation got nowhere. And the affair received the benediction of the Communist party's Daily Worker Monday under the fourth column, page one headline: "METHODIST PARLEY URGES TRUCE AT 38TH PARALLEL."

The body, which is unofficial, failed to act on a year-old request by the church's Council of Bishops that it drop the word "Methodist." Which brings up a curious anomaly.

A Pivot of Controversy.

For some years now, the Federation, claiming 3-4000 members including a few influential bishops, has been a pivot of controversy within the 11,000,000-member Methodist Church. Staunch supporters have turned against the McMichael leadership, including the National Conference of Methodist Youth, the Christian Advocate (the Voice of Methodism) and the influential Zions Herald. Important chapters, such as Boston University's, had announced his re-election would mean their automatic withdrawal.

Yet all this was disregarded in Evanston. And, a handful of 56 delegates made high pronouncements of social and political policy under the Methodist label.

Many of them were right up the Communist alley.

For instance, the delegates called for the seating of Red China in the United Nations "on the condition of a negotiated peace." By a close vote, they defeated a resolution urged by their own executive committee: immediate recognition of Communist China while American troops die in Korea.



REV. McMICHAEL.

stand, which recognizes no difference between the Red aggressors and the democracies, is 100 per cent acceptable to the Communies.

The conference urged the repeal of the McCarran internal security law and the Smith Act, under which the 11 Communist chiefs were convicted. In words that sound familiar to Daily Worker readers, it held "we are

Condemn Dictatorships.

They passed a resolution condemning all dictatorships but refused to name the Soviet Union specifically. Along with the Communists they favored withdrawal of U.N. troops to the 38th parallel.

The Soviet Union and its allies "share in the responsibility for the present international debacle," they declared; both East and West share in the guilt. For propaganda purposes, such a

Fails to Act On Bishops' Plea

moving toward our own brand of fascism."

There were individual attacks on communism. A member of the Federation's executive committee, Dr. Albert Barnett, theology professor at Emory College, Atlanta, warned "You are going out of your way to expound a justification for communism."

Bishop Francis J. McConnell, retired, who was re-elected president, denounced Russian communism for ignoring the Christian concept of the human soul. Some federation members, said the bishop, who had affiliated himself with scores of Communist fronts, might espouse ideas which could "seem like communism." They are definitely not the Stalin type, he assured.

But all in all, the Daily Worker was not displeased.

Meanwhile, the Methodist Church holds its quadrennial conference in San Francisco next April. There's a move afoot to create its own official social action commission. Until it does, this tiny, unrepresentative federation will be carrying the ball as the unofficial political voice of Methodism in this country.

Mr. PATTERSON. I believe that was in 1935. I might be a little wrong on the dates, but research will show, and there we also had a meeting of the fraction while the congress was there and I was together with Dr. Ward in the top fraction meeting in Chicago also.

Mr. KUNZIG. This is a top fraction meeting of the Communist Party?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes; a meeting where only selected top leading Communist Party members could attend. It was a policymaking body.

Mr. KUNZIG. Rev. Harry F. Ward was present?

Mr. PATTERSON. He was present and an active member of that body.

Mr. KUNZIG. And therefore you know Rev. Harry F. Ward as a member of the Communist Party, as a very important member of the Communist Party?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Was he still a member of the party at the time you left the party?

Mr. PATTERSON. To my knowledge, yes, he was still active in the Communist Party front organizations like the National Negro Congress. In fact, I believe in 1935 or 1936 they had a meeting of the congress in Philadelphia, and he was present there and also participated in Communist Party fraction.

Mr. SCHERER. As far as you know, at the time you left the party, he was still a member of the party?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. And you know of his participation in Communist-front organizations subsequent to the date of your leaving the party; is that right?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes. I know he was active in most of the party front organizations, and he was used many times to spearhead a call for such organizations. In other words, he would be among the sponsors to get other so-called professional people, liberal ministers, the party would be able to attract other people that it could not attract otherwise.

Mr. SCHERER. I believe you mentioned Rev. Jack McMichael; did you not?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Would you elaborate just a little bit upon your acquaintance with Reverend McMichael?

Mr. PATTERSON. I became more or less active with him in 1934 at the time that the Young Communist League captured the youth congress held by Viola Ilma. Jack McMichael met together with the bureau of the national committee of young Communists and other leading members of the Young Communist League that the bureau called in and mapped out policy and was giving instructions on how to proceed to capture this conference called by Viola Ilma and to establish the American Youth Congress. He was very active in the establishment of the American Youth Congress. He was also active in the American League Against War and Fascism, the youth section. I was a member of the NAC Bureau when we discussed the question of Jack McMichael and Joe Lash and Charlie White as the leading members of the Young Communist League to work in the American League Against War and Fascism to be responsible to the NAC Bureau for the creating of a broad youth section in the American League Against War and Fascism.

Mr. SCHERER. You knew Reverend McMichael then as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. PATTERSON. Well, I do not know if he exactly was a member of the Communist Party, but I know he was a member of the Young Communist League.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you not have to be a Communist to be a member of the Young Communist League? If he was a leading member——

Mr. PATTERSON. All leading members of the Young Communist League had to be also members of the Communist Party, so by his being one of the leading members, I take it for granted he was a member of the Communist Party, but as such, meeting with him in the Communist Party, I did not, but attended these fraction meetings I talked about, these top fraction meetings, which were meetings of the Communist Party with Young Communist League members present of that committee, that was part and parcel of it.

Mr. SCHERER. But you did know him definitely to be an active member of the Young Communist League?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes, and the Young Communist League, we might state, is part and parcel of the Communist Party. It is not something separate from the Communist Party. When you are a member of the Young Communist League, you are still a Communist.

Mr. KUNZIG. If I get you straight, he did attend these top fraction meetings.

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. You knew him as a Communist irrespective of whether he was a member of the Young Communist League or whether he carried a party card or not, did you not?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes, I knew him definitely as a Communist and as a leading Communist.

Mr. KUNZIG. You never knew any non-Communists to attend any of these fraction meetings, did you?

Mr. PATTERSON. Non-Communists could not attend such fraction meetings.

Mr. KUNZIG. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you ever assigned by the National Committee of the Communist Party to be a member of the Communist Party fraction in the American League Against War and Fascism?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes, I was assigned by the National Committee of the Young Communist League, but I also was a leading member of the Communist Party and I could not have been assigned to that fraction without the approval of the central committee of the Communist Party.

Mr. KUNZIG. Who was assigned with you to become a member of the Communist Party fraction in the American League Against War and Fascism?

Mr. PATTERSON. Dr. Ward.

Mr. KUNZIG. That is Rev. Harry F. Ward?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes, Earl Browder, Manning Johnson, Jerome, I think it is Victor Jerome, Leonard Patterson, and a Communist Party member by the name of Davis, who was a postal employee and used to be such an organizer of the Communist Party in Milwaukee in 1929, and I cannot think of the rest of them just now.

Mr. KUNZIG. I would like to ask you one further question. Did you ever see any examples of young ministers sent out to churches by the Union Theological Seminary who were Communists?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you describe that to the committee?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes. While I was in Baltimore, two members who had graduated from Dr. Ward's seminary came down to Baltimore for assignment for their ministerial duties, and at the same time they came for assignment for their Communist duties from the section committee of the Baltimore section of the Communist Party.

Mr. SCHERER. Let us get that straight.

Mr. PATTERSON. Two young ministers who had graduated out of the seminary—I might not pronounce this—and if I cannot, so excuse me—taught or lived by Dr. Ward.

Mr. SCHERER. You say you cannot pronounce the seminary. Does anybody know the name?

Mr. KERLEY. Union Theological Seminary.

Mr. KUNZIG. That is already in the record.

Mr. PATTERSON. Upon graduation they were sent down into Baltimore for an assignment. Let me try to break this down a little further. I believe this was in 1935, the time that Mussolini invaded Ethiopia because they worked on my committee.

I will come to that a little later.

When they came down there for their ministerial assignments, they also came down for their Communist Party assignments from the section committee of the Baltimore section. They were party members when they got there. They explained that they were recruited as party members by Dr. Ward while they were studying under him. This was reported to the section committee, and I heard this and they were given the assignment to work with me at that time, were head of a committee for the defense of Ethiopia against the Italian invasion, and they served on my committee which, you know, gave it a little color, helping each other in places

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you recall the names of those men?

Mr. PATTERSON. At the present time I cannot think of their names.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you think if you were given time and opportunity to talk to people, you might be able to remember these men's names or find out who these ministers were?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes, and I believe if sufficient research work would be done in Baltimore around 1935 on—

Mr. WALTER. What churches were they assigned to?

Mr. PATTERSON. I do not recall what churches they were assigned to.

Mr. SCHERER. They were Methodists?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes; they were Methodists. At that time I did not go to church—I believe around 1935 and 1936. If research work was done in connection with the party front organizations, you might trace that.

Mr. SCHERER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Patterson, you just said at the time these two young ministers were assigned to the Communist Party activity in Baltimore, you were not going to church.

Mr. PATTERSON. That is right.

Mr. SCHERER. Are you going to church today?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. And would you mind telling us what church you are connected with?

Mr. PATTERSON. I am now a member and officer and ordained deacon of Mount Calvary United American Free Will Baptist Church at Madison and Patchen, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you have any more questions?

Mr. KUNZIG. I have no further questions.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Patterson, the committee wishes to thank you for your testimony here today. It has been very helpful.

I wish, however, and I suppose you will cooperate with some member of the staff who is going to contact you in an effort to determine who these two ministers were, or to help you recollect their names.

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes. I would like to say in closing that we had right down here in Foley Square in 1933 a couple of ministers who were members of the Communist Party. These were Negro ministers. I cannot think of their names but they testified on the stand here when some members of the Communist Party were arrested for Communist Party activities. The party put them on the stand as witnesses for the party.

Mr. SCHERER. Perhaps the investigator might talk to you about those, too.

The two ministers you say were enlisted into the party by Dr. Ward, were they white or colored?

Mr. PATTERSON. White.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SCHERER. I believe that is all, and you are discharged from your subpoena.

We will meet tomorrow at 10 a. m. The hearing is recessed until that time.

(Whereupon, at 4:20 p. m., the hearing recessed, to 10 a. m., Wednesday, July 8, 1953.)

×

